

# CHURCH QUARTERLY REVIEW

July — September 1959

LONDON  
S · P · C · K

1959

*Published by S.P.C.K.  
Holy Trinity Church, Marylebone Road, London, N.W.1*

*Printed in Great Britain by  
The Talbot Press (S.P.C.K.), Saffron Walden, Essex*

# CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE

The Rev. Leonard Hodgson, D.D.  
The Rev. Canon E. S. Abbott,  
Warden of Keble College, Oxford.

The Rt Rev. R. C. Mortimer,  
Bishop of Exeter.  
The Rev. Canon Charles Smyth.

## EDITOR

The Rt Rev. and Rt Hon. J. W. C. Wand, K.C.V.O., D.D.

---

## CONTENTS

### EDITORIAL

THE NEW JOINT TRANSLATION OF THE BIBLE	<i>E. Milner-White</i>
FROM JESUS TO ST PAUL	<i>B. M. G. Reardon</i>
JUDAISM IN EGYPT—A.D. 70-135	<i>L. W. Barnard</i>
QUMRAN AND THE CHRISTIAN MINISTRY	<i>Barnabas Lindars, S.S.F.</i>
THE SERMONS OF J. M. NEALE	<i>A. G. Lough</i>
FIVE POETS ON RELIGION—I. DRYDEN, POPE, AND YOUNG	<i>Arthur Pollard</i>
PUBLIC RELATIONS FOR THE CHURCH	<i>Glyn Morley Davies</i>
CORRESPONDENCE	

### REVIEWS

*A detailed list of books and reviewers appears on the following pages.*

## REVIEWS

- J. B. PHILLIPS: *The New Testament in Modern English.*  
By the Bishop of Peterborough
- JEAN STEINMANN: *Saint John the Baptist and the Desert Tradition.*  
By C. S. Mann, O.S.B.
- CARROLL E. SIMCOX: *They Met at Philippi.*  
By Robin Anstey
- ROBERT E. D. CLARK: *Darwin: Before and After.*  
By P. W. Kent
- C. S. LEWIS: *Reflections on the Psalms.*  
By T. L. Manson, S.S.J.E.
- L. MALEVEZ, S.J.: *The Christian Message and Myth.*  
By S. H. Hooke
- LOUIS BOUYER: *The Cistercian Heritage.*  
By A. J. Macdonald
- ULRICH SIMON: *Heaven in the Christian Tradition.*  
By the Editor
- FREDERICK DENISON MAURICE: *The Kingdom of Christ.*  
By C. T. Chapman
- F. F. BRUCE: *The Spreading Flame.*  
By Gordon Huelin
- MARCEL SIMON: *St Stephen and the Hellenists in the Primitive Church.*  
By H. E. W. Turner
- BASIL F. L. CLARKE: *Anglican Cathedrals outside the British Isles.*  
By Seiriol Evans
- Nottingham Mediaeval Studies. Vol. I.  
By Gordon Huelin
- WILLIAM MULDER: *Homeward to Zion: The Mormon Migration from Scandinavia.*  
By Jakób Jocz
- RONALD A. KNOX (tr.): *Autobiography of a Saint.*  
By T. Dilworth-Harrison
- J. W. C. WAND: *True Lights.*  
By Gordon Huelin
- H. KIRK-SMITH: *William Thomson, Archbishop of York.*  
By the Editor
- PAUL A. WELSBY: *Lancelot Andrewes: 1555-1626.*  
By Charles Smyth
- WILLIAM TEMPLE: *Religious Experience: and other Essays and Addresses.*  
By G. J. Inglis
- J. E. L. OULTON: *Fundamentals of the Faith: Papers, Addresses, and Sermons.*  
By R. R. Hartford
- N. LE P. WARNER: *Hugh Compton Warner.*  
J. S. Leatherbarrow
- HOLMES WELCH: *The Parting of the Way: Lao Tzu and the Taoist Movement.*  
By G. F. S. Gray

W. P. WITCUTT: *The Rise and Fall of the Individual*;  
GIOVANNI MIEGGE: *Visible and Invisible: Christian  
Affirmations in a Secular Age.* By Adam Fox

PAUL ELMER MORE: *The Sceptical Approach to Religion.*  
By C. T. Chapman

WHIT BURNETT (ed.): *This is my Philosophy*; EDMUND W.  
SINNOTT: *Matter, Mind and Man*; IVOR LECLERC:  
*Whitehead's Metaphysics.* By I. T. Ramsey

H. L. PHILP: *Jung and the Problem of Evil.* By L. W. Grensted

JOHN WILSON: *Language and Christian Belief.*  
By Humphrey Green

KENNETH ULYETT (ed.): *My Key to Life.* By T. Dilworth-Harrison

HERBERT MUSURILLO, S.J. (tr. and ed.): *St Methodius:  
The Symposium, a Treatise on Chastity.*  
By S. M. Gibbard, S.S.J.E.

EWART LEWIS: *Prayer Book Revision in the Church of  
Wales.* By E. C. Whitaker

*The Oxford Book of School Worship. Part II Juniors.*  
*Part III Seniors.* By Frank A. F. Poulden

S. J. P. VAN DIJK, O.F.M., and J. HAZELDEN WALKER: *The  
Myth of the Aumbry*; R. C. MORTIMER: *The Celebrant  
and Ministers of the Eucharist.* By G. B. Timms

J. ALAN KAY (ed.): *Wesley's Prayers and Praises.*  
By H. G. G. Herklots

LORD ALTRINCHAM: *Two Anglican Essays*; D. M. PATON  
(ed.): *Essays in Anglican Self-Criticism.* By H. A. Blair

DEWI MORGAN: *Lambeth Speaks; Lambeth 1958 and You*;  
E. L. MASCALL: *Lambeth 1958 and Christian Unity.*  
By H. M. Waddams

E. L. MASCALL: *The Recovery of Unity*; A. L. PECK:  
*Anglicanism and Episcopacy.* By Eric Kemp

JAMES GRIFFITHS, M.P.: *Livingstone's Africa—Yesterday and  
To-day.* By A. E. A. Sulston

THOMAS WOOD: *The Pastoral Responsibility of the  
Church To-day*; J. C. FENTON: *Preaching the Cross*;  
H. M. WADDAMS: *Believing.* By George Reindorp

E. K. ELLIS: *The Work of a Pastor.* By George M. Bosworth



J. R. H. MOORMAN (ed.): *Curate of Souls*; J. H. L. MORRELL  
(ed.): *The Heart of a Priest*. By George M. Bosworth  
A. R. WINNETT: *Divorce and Re-marriage in Anglicanism*.  
By F. E. P. S. Langton  
WAYNE E. OATES: *Anxiety in Christian Experience*.  
By Norman Small

## CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS ISSUE

- The Very Reverend E. MILNER-WHITE, Dean of York, is a member of the Commission preparing the new translation of the Bible.
- The Reverend B. M. G. REARDON is Rector of Kelly with Bradstone, Devon.
- The Reverend L. W. BARNARD is Vicar of Shaw, Melksham, Wiltshire.
- Mr ARTHUR POLLARD is Lecturer in the Department of English Language and Literature in the University of Manchester.
- The Reverend A. G. LOUGH is Vicar of Hennock, Newton Abbott, Devon.
- The Reverend BARNABAS LINDARS, S.S.F., is a member of the Society of St Francis.
- Mr G. MORLEY DAVIES has had many years' professional experience in Public Relations, mainly in the Public Services and in industry.

## EDITORIAL

THE January number of *Theology To-day* carries an article on the Taizé community. It is particularly interesting because the writer, Malcolm Boyd, has spent three months living with the brothers and is able to report vividly what he has seen.

Briefly, Taizé is a Protestant monastery of about forty members established in the little farming village of that name in Burgundy. Its founders were Roger Schutz, a young theologian from the Swiss S.C.M., Max Thurian, who is making a name as a liturgiologist, and Pierre Souveran, an agricultural engineer. Headquarters are housed in the ancient château of the village: the twelfth century Clugniac church has become the chapel.

Taizé is not regarded as a place for cloistered withdrawal so much as a centre for mission. It appears to be used much as Australian Bush Brothers use their centre-house, to give an opportunity for the quarterly meetings for retreat and refreshment of men who normally work hundreds of miles apart. Only in this case, although a proportion of the brotherhood are always at Taizé, meetings of the *whole* body must be much less frequent, since the area covered by the brothers on mission must be even more extensive, stretching as it does from North Africa to Germany.

The first seven brothers took their life vows of celibacy, community of property, and acceptance of the authority of the brotherhood in 1947. They have evolved a Rule, in accordance with which there is a two years' novitiate. The first founder, Roger Schutz, is Prior, and Max Thurian is Sub-Prior. The fully professed members form the governing council. Their first duty is the care of each other's souls; each brother has another who hears his confession and acts as his guide, counsellor, and friend. Inevitably corporate worship is closely tied up with the new liturgical movement. (We hope ourselves in a later number to publish something that Max Thurian has had to say about it.) The community also maintains close connections with the World Council of Churches, whose central office is not far away in Geneva. The brothers, clerical and lay, continue to carry on as far as possible the work for which they were trained; and what each earns over and above his immediate needs goes into the common fund. One of the brothers, Eric de Saussure, has already attained considerable fame by his paintings.

A community of sisters following the rule of Taizé has sprung up at Grandchamp in Switzerland.<sup>1</sup> There is a considerable body of friends of both sexes living in the world who are banded together under a simple discipline as the Third Order of Unity. How much of the Taizé movement is due to the impulse of the Oxford Revival or to such earlier Anglican examples as Little Gidding is not clear. In any case it is mainly a Swiss affair: it is interesting that not so long ago acute observers were complaining of the dullness and lack of vitality in the religion of Protestant Switzerland.

Not the least important work that S.C.M. is doing for us is the regular publication of "Studies in Biblical Theology". The two latest numbers are among the most interesting.<sup>2</sup> Both perform admirably their proper function of summing up research in their respective fields and so providing us with a point of new departure.

J. T. Milik is a Polish priest who has been actively associated with the explorations at Qumran. (It is intriguing to find the S.C.M. publication carrying the *Nihil obstat* and *Imprimatur* of R.C. officials.) He gives us a volume well furnished with maps and plates. He tells once again, but with commendable brevity, the story of the discovery, and describes in detail the contents of the Qumran cache.

What is most interesting is that he ignores all the talk about the revelation of new sects in Judaism and regards the whole story as quite simply a history of the Essenes. This throws a very different light on the family of the Maccabees from that which is shed by the Apocrypha. The secular ambitions of Jonathan produced a pietistic reaction among the Hasidim. About 150 B.C. this resulted in an exodus to the desert led by the Teacher of Righteousness, a guide whose further identification is impossible. A settlement was established at Qumran, where some traces of much earlier habitation already existed. Modest buildings were erected there (Phase Ia); but they did not escape the notice of Jonathan, who, having been named High Priest, felt himself justified in visiting and actually persecuting the Qumran colony, thus earning for himself the title of Wicked Priest.

<sup>1</sup> See "The Community of Grandchamp", C.Q.R., Vol. CLVII, No. 322 (Jan.-March 1956), pp. 47-55.

<sup>2</sup> No. 25. J. H. Robinson, *A New Quest of the Historical Jesus*, 9s. 6d. No. 26. J. T. Milik, *Ten Years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judea*, 12s. 6d.



The second period came when Hyrcanus filled the double rôle of High Priest and Ethnarch. His antipathy for the Pharisees led to a fresh influx to Qumran and also to an "exodus" of other Essenes to Damascus (c. 110 B.C.) Judging from the size of the buildings, which were now enlarged, this must have been the most prosperous period (Phase Ib) of the Qumran community.

In 64 B.C. Syria became a Roman province, and there are in the documents many references to the Kitiim, who are here identified as the Romans. From 40—38 there was a Parthian invasion and about that time the Qumran settlement was burnt; and in 31 it was further damaged by earthquake. The settlement seems then to have been deserted until about the beginning of the Christian era, when it was reconstructed by the Essenes on a smaller scale (Phase II). The end came when some of the members resorted to force and took part in the first Jewish revolt. In the summer of A.D. 68 the settlement was destroyed and a Roman fort established on the site.

Fr Milik does not believe that Essenism exercised much influence on the earliest phase of Christianity. There are few parallels between the Synoptic Gospels and the Qumran documents. More have been discovered with Paul and John, and there is a family likeness with the early community of goods, prayers, and meals depicted in Acts. The impression gained is that the influence of Essenism increased as the Church developed: indeed in the case of the Ebionites it may have almost submerged the Christian element. There is disappointingly little evidence to help us solve our difficulties over the early history of the ministry although both bodies clearly held the eschatological conception of the true Israel ruled by twelve leaders.

---

Dr J. M. Robinson, a professor from South Carolina, has already done good work in this series with his earlier volume *The Problem of History in Mark*. Unfortunately his profound studies in Germany have ruined his English style. He never uses a simple word where a newly-coined technical one will do. Nevertheless his book is extremely important as the most up-to-date estimate of the current trends in gospel studies. It will well repay the most careful reading.

His thesis is the inevitable abandonment of the earlier quest of the historical Jesus under the attacks first of literary and then of historical criticism, and finally of Bultmann's existential theology

and his demand for "demythologizing". He rightly insists, however, that enquiry is not likely to stop there. Bultmann bases his all on "encounter". An encounter is not of much use unless you know what kind of person you encounter. A defender of Bultmann, Dr Robinson would like to suggest that Bultmann himself is now beginning to see this truth, and either of his own initiative or under pressure from his pupils is trying to find a more historical basis for his theology.

Where is wisdom to be found? If the gospels, their literary sources, and even the "forms" behind them are all so interpretative in the interests of a particular christology that one cannot get at the bare facts, what hope is there of finding anything from which a reliable picture may be drawn? The answer lies in the Kerygma. The proclamation of the good news was precisely that something had happened. This was not the mere objectivization of a religious idea. As Bultmann himself says, "The historical person of Jesus makes Paul's preaching gospel". When you have demythologized the Kerygma the residuum is Jesus himself—the event that made salvation possible. What the Kerygma is trying to get across is "the existential meaningfulness of a historical person", and that not by emphasis upon this or that detail in character or chronicle but by a specific understanding of Jesus' life. The question for investigation now is whether we can conclude that the Kerygma's understanding of Jesus' significance is identical with his own understanding of his own existence.

If it be objected that Jesus certainly did not preach a christology while the Kerygma did, the answer is that at least the decision demanded by Jesus required and implied a christology. Similarly if one says that Christ preached the Kingdom while Paul preached Christ, or that Jesus' message was eschatological while the Church's Kerygma is christological, one finds that the actual decision demanded in both cases is the same. Whatever one may think of all this, it is interesting to observe that we are at last passing beyond the demythologizing stage and getting back on to a more extended historical basis.

# THE NEW JOINT TRANSLATION OF THE BIBLE<sup>1</sup>

E. MILNER-WHITE

IN THIS our century, the Bible in England is writing a new chapter of its own history. It is not that the A.V. is losing rank, any more than it can ever lose the splendour of its diction; or that, after a monumental achievement in history for the English soul, it is showing the debility of old age: its very archaisms can still add light and depth to meditation upon the divine. But in a new generation, for good or ill, the new ordinary man is impatient of treasure even lightly hidden; he has no time to waste over the slightly obscure, and no trust in what looks out of date. So he ceases to read a Bible of words and modes of expression no longer familiar to him, and therefore not quite real.

("Quite real"—there are two words which have given us continual trouble in the new translation. Are they genuine modern English, or merely colloquial? Are they transient jargon? Are they up to any standard of dignity that holy writ must demand? Again, is "holy writ" an archaism, or, worse, a cliché, or worse still, journalese? I cannot help, at this early stage, letting you see something of the translator's troubles!)

The new chapter opens because it is now impossible to bring the A.V. up to date. The American Revised Standard Version marks probably the last attempt, and fair success has followed its daring. But the truer sign of this century is the stream of new versions—Weymouth, Moffatt, the Twentieth Century New Testament, Knox, and the paraphrases or partial translations of Mr Phillips, Dr Rieu, and Bishop Wand, to name only the most notable. What also we are apt to forget are the immense number of translations into living tongues, newly learning Christ, the world over. The patina of age, the grace of literary splendour, an august and beloved tradition—these can never be *essential* to the delivery of *a Word that is God's*.

Try no more patchings. Leave the A.V. to stand in its own unapproachable grandeur. Our language in 350 years has changed and

<sup>1</sup> This Ethel M. Wood Lecture, given in the Senate House of London University on 10 March 1959, was illustrated throughout by relevant passages from the new translation, which, however, are not available for quotation in print before the publication of the translation.



is changing. In syntax, in rhythm, in the meaning of words. Also a century of intense scholarship has produced texts more accurate, and linguistic understandings more subtle.

So came in 1948 the scheme of a new translation into the English of to-day, which should be official to the extent of being the joint work of all the Christian Communions of the United Kingdom, the Roman Catholic only excepted, and sponsored jointly by the University Presses of Oxford and Cambridge. To Scotland and its Church should be given the praise for the initial impulse, and the General Secretaryship throughout has been held by a Scot. But we are all in it with passionate interest and irrefragable harmony. A Bishop of the Church of England occupies the Chair; the immense responsibility of the General Directorship has fallen on the shoulders of a Congregationalist—Dr Dodd—who well can bear it, even if he had not behind him the burning loyalty of his large team. The composition of the Joint Governing Committee includes six members of the Church of England; three each of the Church of Scotland, the Methodist Church, the Congregational Church, the Baptist Church; two each represent the Society of Friends, the Churches in Ireland, the British and Foreign Bible Society, and the National Bible Society of Ireland; one each the Churches of Wales and the Presbyterian Church of England. When we come to the Panels of Translators, Hebraist and Grecian, linguistic and textual scholarship is the sole ground of choice; while the Literary Panel, graced by Professors of Oxford and Cambridge, draws from acknowledged skill in the craft of English letters.

Not that any such eminence attaches to myself, who am a member of this Panel merely by nomination of the York House of Convocation! That, I may say, has been one of the great good fortunes of a singularly fortunate life. (I find comfort from a famous critic's comment on the forty-seven translators of the A.V., "The excellence of their work is certainly not due to the presence of many, if any, distinguished men of letters as such".) What is the translation intended to do? To whom is it to be addressed? This is what we have been told by the General Director :

The new translation is not intended, in the first place, for reading in church, nor is it directed, primarily, to those for whom the language of the A.V. and the Book of Common Prayer is the familiar and natural language of devotion.

The public in view consists of the following classes :



1. The large section of the population which has no effective contact with the Church in any of its communions, and for whom the A.V. has no associations. Such people are often keenly interested to know what the Bible is about. They are sufficiently educated to understand quite a lot of the Bible, if it were put before them in language which was acceptable to them; but since they are unfamiliar with the traditional language of the Church's worship, and often unfamiliar with Jacobean English (apart from the plays of Shakespeare they read at school), the language of the current versions is in part actually unintelligible or misleading, and where it is not actually unintelligible has *an air of unreality*.

2. The young people now growing up and being educated in "modern" schools of various kinds, for whom the Bible, if it is to make any impact, must be made "contemporary". If the A.V. is still used in instruction (as one hopes it will be used), a second version is greatly to be desired, as a key to the meaning.

3. A considerable number of intelligent people who do attend church, and for whom the traditional language is so familiar that its phrases slide over their minds almost without stirring a ripple.

With this tripartite public in view, we aim at a version which shall be *genuinely English in idiom*, such as will not awaken a sense of strangeness or remoteness, but will avoid equally both archaisms and transient modernisms. It should *not* aim at preserving "hallowed associations"; it *should* be without pedantry. It is to be hoped that, at least occasionally, it may produce arresting and memorable renderings. It should have sufficient dignity to be read aloud. Although it is not intended primarily to be read in church, we should like to think it may prove worthy to be read occasionally, even at public worship, in circumstances where it seems desirable, and we hope such use may in some form receive sanction from the ecclesiastical authorities. This however, it should be repeated, is not the primary aim. We should like to produce a translation which may receive general recognition as an authoritative second version alongside the A.V. for certain public purposes as well as for private reading, and above all a translation which may in some measure succeed in removing a real barrier between a large proportion of our fellow-countrymen and the truth of the Holy Scriptures.

If this is to be a new translation, not a revision of the A.V. or the R.V., what about the text to be employed? The Joint Committee laid down simply that it was to be the best ascertainable in the judgement of competent authorities. That judgement is sufficiently up to date to have taken, in Isaiah for instance, the Dead Sea scrolls

fully into account—not that these have made any serious difference. Pure conjectures may not be admitted to the text; this applies as well to conjectural *rearrangements* as to verbal changes. “Extremely rigorous”, says the Joint Committee, must be the degree of evidence required for the adoption of emendations, in particular those resting upon a presumed Aramaic original behind the Greek gospels.

How, then, do the Panels *work together*? Our system has not proved cumbrous in practice, though it may seem so in the telling. The Old Testament Panel, say, deposes one of its members to make a draft translation of Exodus. His draft is considered and amended by the whole O.T. Panel, which decides also on the true text as alternatives or obscurities arise. Then the completed translation is sent to the Literary Panel. The Literary Panel meets, works through it, revises it from the literary angle. Our revision is re-circulated to the O.T. Panel with every change, great or small, underlined. The O.T. Panel accepts or rejects each item, or asks the Literary Panel to reconsider this one or that. Thus an agreed English draft is arrived at and embodied in a “Pink Book”, i.e. ready for the final revision which will precede the actual going to press. The process is not as slow as it sounds; and it is peaceful. No feeling exists between the panels but of trust: our O.T. brethren (though I ought not to use that word of them—it is archaic!) not only do not resent our free handling of their prose, but almost cheer us on! But you must not imagine that any draft they send to us is crudely literal or clumsy in its English. Far from it; already it is good; and as soon as our colleagues of both O.T. and N.T. Panels tumbled to our idiosyncrasies of expression and rhythm they played to them, just as we humbly obey their insistences that we must never render *hesed* by “loving kindness”, nor *peirasmos* by “temptation”.

The Convenor of the O.T. Panel wrote this in a recent letter to me, and as it comes, so to speak from the other side, it is witness worth hearing: “Of this I am certain: we have never refused an L.P. modification unless it was clear to us that it did not adequately represent the Hebrew. This quite often meant that *we* had not said what we meant to say, and had used language which gave a false impression. This kind of correction is one of the most useful services you have rendered us . . .”

I think the presence of the O.T. Convenor is the saving feature. Quite often he has to say, “I agree that this is much better English

than ours, but it is not just what the Hebrew means." Then we always drop it at once. Sometimes he has to say, "I could accept that myself, but I cannot guarantee the approval of the O.T. Panel. It will, I think, be worth trying." And generally (so far as my memory goes) the O.T. Panel *does* accept it. I have always been impressed by the mutual confidence that the Panels have in one another, and their readiness to give way.

Owing to its interest, I must refer, all too briefly, to a second last-minute letter from the Convenor. For my sake and yours, he had spent three days in collating three drafts of Isaiah 1-39; the original draft of the O.T. Panel sent up to the Literary Panel; that of the Literary Panel's changes; and the final "Pink Book" embodying the O.T. Panel's acceptance and rejections, and the consequent agreed solutions of the rejections with the Literary Panel.

"I find", he writes, "between 1300 and 1400 modifications suggested in these 39 chapters by your panel. We had doubts concerning 70 of these. That is to say, we accepted nearly 95% of your modifications."

That is surely proof of our harmony! I wish I could quote some of the examples he listed of these "agreed solutions". I found them fascinating—and had totally forgotten everyone of them!

Turn now to our own purely literary problems. Let me preface them with these governing principles.

*First.* The *diction* of the A.V., even where it is proverbial and therefore still habitual in modern speech, is to be wholly eschewed. We may not put an old patch on a new garment. It is sometimes very hard. Nevertheless the A.V. has an indirect influence upon us, both potent and wholesome: its standards stimulate us to an English of to-day as good as we can compass.

*Second.* Here our instructions do set us walking on a knife-edge. What is this modern English we are to attempt? It is certainly not to be basic, certainly not journalese, nor is it even to be colloquial: these dangers yawn on one side. On the other, no tinge of the archaic can be permitted, nor yet the conscious literary English of the essay, nor any attempt at the monumental or the high-flown. Rather the familiar speech of to-day—provided it is grammatical—has been the aim, and it is often puzzling to define its limits on one side or the other of the dividing lines. One liberty has not been denied us—to heighten both the tone and the vocabulary when dealing with the poetical. Inevitable, of course, but most merciful.

*Third.* You all know how difficult it is to turn good French or good German into good English, and how rarely successful. The idioms and the periods are no different that you must break up and remake the sentences wholesale. Only with a wide freedom can you create a construe that is at once faithful and idiomatic. But in translating Holy Scripture, even this vital freedom must be severely disciplined. The issues for theology, for the integrity of a Divine Word, are too grave to allow of any translation but the literal. No liberties can be taken in altering or adding. That rules out even the paraphrase (except on the rarest occasions). You may not use two coupled nouns or verbs to bring out the exact force of one in the original. The breaking up and remaking of sentences can be done only with meticulous care that nothing be lost. In fact, for biblical translation, we are thrown back on Coleridge's wretchedly inadequate definition of style as "nothing but the clear definition of meaning". And so we are left trembling under Ronald Knox's threat of doom, that where "literalness has been accepted as rule, dullness has been the result".

So much for general promises: let us return to our craftsmen at the table. They are seeking to improve the accurate translation sent up to them. Now there are always three factors to be taken into account at one and the same moment. I will call them, the Sense, the Sound, and the Style. Each is vital to a good rendering, and the numberless diverse details of each must be faithful to a triple whole.

*The Sense.* That, we have seen, must be absolutely accurate to the original. The English must omit no shade of the original meaning. Also it must be made utterly lucid to the modern reader, whether he be religious or non-religious. That brings us up against the technical vocabulary of theology, against such words as "grace", "sanctify", "justification"—for the last two there is no equivalent. The smaller verbal problems are beyond count. "Behold", "lo", "woe to", and both the vocative and the interjectionary "O!" are ruled out as archaic, leaving us with feebler things like "See!", "Look!", and "Alas!". Let me add, that we are brave enough to prove our rules by an occasional exception, e.g. "Behold the man!" Then what battles have been fought amongst ourselves over the choice of the right word! How find a word to replace "to grudge" which has just the right shade of greater violence than that? How replace "they raged at her" by something which should mean certainly less noisy than "they raged at", but certainly more so than "they were angry



with" her. There are actually twelve Hebrew words for which we have only one in English, the verb "destroy". Persons, cities, whole peoples are so often destroyed in the Old Testament. We could not reduce this destruction—after all, our own age sins and suffers as badly—but we did want, and work, to destroy the word "destroy"!

Graver issues arise than these. For instance, the translation of our Lord's habitual *amen*, *lego humin* recurring 30 times in St Matthew, 13 in St Mark, 7 in St Luke; and in St John 25 times in the yet stronger form *amen amen*. "Verily, verily" is doomed as archaic. In early drafts we tried to vary the rendering in such a way as yet to keep its force as an opening to an emphatic utterance. "Believe me", "In very truth I tell you", etc. Later both N.T. and Literary Panels have been changing their mind. So marked an idiom and use, peculiar to our Lord himself among all the world's teachers, were faithfully represented only by a single consistent recurring phrase—as in the Greek. Accordingly, we have tried to find a phrase to reproduce the force of *amen* in a simple manner which can bear constant repetition.

Perplexities over sentences and phrases out-number those over single words: the change of a Hebrew or a Greek idiom into an English without losing colour or nuance; the substitution of English uses in connecting sentences, in opening paragraphs, in siting emphasis or climax, in the treatment of inversions and ellipses, in the disciplining of subordinate sentences. Could we find English imagery to parallel Hebrew, which has lost all meaning for modern men? Ought we even to try? Is the lovely use of the subjunctive (e.g. "if he come") any longer justifiable in our common usage? The story of the Literary Panel for ten years has been a sequence of these logomachies, hundreds of them—for me certainly the happiest and most placid in a lifetime of great wars.

*Sound.* Good sound is vital to prose which is likely to be read aloud—to prose plain and poetical alike. The category of "sound" covers much more than such details as, say the avoidance of weak endings, or of tiresome alliterations, or of words made awkward for the tongue by juxtaposition, or of too long a string of monosyllables or too dreary a repeat of auxiliary verbs. Our ears guard against such dissonances by the wholesome and regular practice of reading aloud every paragraph before we touch it, and again after we have altered it. But nothing can defend our ears against the third person singular of the inescapable verb "to say"—"Now will

I arise, says the Lord" (Isa. 33. 10). Here is a sickness of our mother tongue without remedy. Fortunately, "say" and "said" have some tone and weight; but no dignity or poetry can walk with the mean and sibilant "sez". Only in prophetic passages can it be turned into the worthier "This is the word of the Lord". But better far is the simple grandeur of the A.V., "Thus saith the Lord".

Far more important, sound includes all the *mysteries of rhythm*, indefinable, pervasive, subject to no laws and yet the very secret not only of beauty but even of worth in prose. In the sister field of liturgy, it is true to say that through the centuries many prayers of *thin content* have survived, but none of *poor rhythm*.

But has modern English any recognizable rhythm? Do we, can we, however unconsciously, appreciate it, feel it good or bad? Until this ten years' discipline I had not consciously found, though I had long sought it. All of us can recognize the different rhythms of English prose of the seventeenth, the eighteenth, and the mid-nineteenth centuries when isolated or set in opposition to one another. They are indeed wholly different. If we cannot analyse or define their contrasts, we can in a figure picture them. Stuart prose, born in the Elizabethan days and still called by the queenly name, is like the sea as espied from the shore of a wide bay, splendid in the sun, glittering blue, gold, and silver sparkling in endless lively motion. The Georgian or Augustan, the prose of Gibbon and Dr Johnson, is more like ocean waters watched from a deck, slow rolling and heaving, solemn, sonorous, and a little dull. Well, I have learned to hear our own rhythm, no less distinct, no less marked, but suggesting the scene from a jutting cliff round which two currents meet, with sharp angular wavelets each with its swift cap or climax of foam. Is ours a style of "white horses"? But the discipline of our work has taught me the distinctive rhythm, "the white horses", of our own common speech—and I assure you, it has its own music, and its own time and beat.

*Style.* And so we arrive at the third constituent, now the servant, now the master of both Sense and Sound. Style is the outcome of an individual writer's manipulation of the language, words, periods, and rhythms of his own day. It is his own music—if it be music. In the Old and New Testaments there are as many styles as there are writers. A committee, such as ourselves, may or even must express themselves in the tongue of their own day, but that does not mean that it reduces the whole Bible to a *single style*. The style

which a true translation would and should somehow reproduce is the style of an Isaiah (perhaps three Isaiahs), or a Psalmist, or Job, or St Mark, or St Paul, or St John. At first blush, this, in a translation, would seem impossible. But to a limited, even to a sufficient degree, it is not only easy but unpreventable. *For the writers themselves come through their writings, and come through also any sympathetic translation of them.* The tones, the grammar, the structure, the flow may be the English of to-day; but the voice is the voice of Isaiah or John. The author remains dominant; we cannot change that, nor would we ever wish to be other than faithful to him. To preserve the writer's identity thus, preserves also the atmosphere of his age, some authentic salient aspect of it, at least: to lose it would be to impoverish the Bible itself.

# FROM JESUS TO ST PAUL

B. M. G. REARDON

## I

TO PASS from the gospels to the epistles of St Paul is, it is little exaggeration to say, to move from one world into another. Much more is involved than a mere difference of literary form. On the one hand we have a simple expository teaching, unencumbered by rhetoric, subtle arguments, or scholastic phraseology, and characterized by imagery, always of a singular aptness, drawn from the scenes and circumstances of common life. Its whole content lies within the framework of Palestinian Judaism and even a modified Hellenism appears altogether foreign to it. On the other, however—in the doctrine of the apostle—we encounter a state of mind akin to the Hellenized Judaism of the Diaspora; albeit of one who is practised in the—to us—artificial and sophisticated modes of contemporary rabbinic reasoning. It has often indeed been urged that Paul was himself a thoroughgoing Hellenist; but this is unwarranted. That his thinking shows many traces of Hellenism is undeniable: he employs language and even ideas the provenance of which is plainly Greek and not Jewish. But it is seldom if ever more than a surface Hellenism. On the important question, for instance, of the relation of body and soul Paul uses the accepted Greek terminology, whereas his actual thought remains consistently that of a Jew.

Jesus' mental horizon was confined to the frontiers of his native land. The pagan world beyond seems to have presented no problem to him. If he admitted, as evidently he did, that non-Jews like the Centurion of Capernaum or the Woman of Canaan might have a place in the Kingdom of God, their qualifications were nevertheless exceptional and raised no issue of principle. In praising their faith Jesus sought rather to stimulate that of his co-religionists than to abolish the "middle wall of partition", as St Paul calls it, between them and the Gentiles. For the apostle, on the contrary, the question of the pagan world is one which he cannot evade. He himself was born within that world—at Tarsus in Cilicia, to be precise, a notable centre of Greek culture—and there too, presumably, reared (despite Acts 22. 3); whilst before his conversion he had in all probability held the recognized office of *schaliach*—that of "apostle" or liaison between the central authorities at Jerusalem and the communities of the dispersion. The pagan milieu to which he was



accustomed could hardly therefore have been other than a determining influence in his life and outlook.

The idea of the Kingdom of God, which in the teaching of Jesus predominates, had in Paul's thinking, at least as we know it, only a subordinate rôle. The associated term, "Son of man" which again in Jesus' mouth is of constant recurrence, finds in the Pauline epistles no mention at all. Central no doubt to Paul's doctrine, as to that of his Master, is a deeply held belief in the forgiveness of sins, but it is very differently presented. With Jesus it is a forgiveness which he has himself the right and the power to proclaim: "The Son of man", he declares, "has authority on earth to forgive sins."<sup>1</sup> By it is meant deliverance from the thralldom in which men through their sins are kept by Satan and his devils and it takes the form both of the healing of the sick—"Which is easier", Jesus asks, "to say to the paralytic, Your sins are forgiven, or to say, Rise, take up your pallet and walk?"—and the casting out of evil spirits; no condition is attached to it beyond that of a trusting and grateful acceptance of the Good News from God. Forgiveness is accorded, that is, here and now and in no wise depends on the future fulfilment of some work of expiation as yet unwrought. Moreover it is final and sufficient, provided only that the repentance is sincere and lasting. Admittedly phrases are to be found in the gospels which suggest that it also was Jesus' conscious intent "to give his life a ransom for many",<sup>2</sup> and the authenticity of such words is not especially doubtful. But neither should we overweigh them. They convey a simple image, not a theological doctrine of vicarious atonement.

## 2

When, fifty or sixty years ago, the problem of the relation of Paul to Jesus was more keenly debated than it is to-day, there existed two clearly defined schools of thought. On the one side were the conservatives who, though not rejecting New Testament criticism as such, nevertheless distrusted it; it had its uses, but you never knew whither it might lead. The difference between Jesus and Paul was in their view formal only, not essential: what was implicit in the gospels simply became explicit in the epistles. The apostle's task was to express theologically what the Master had taught mainly by figure and example. Seeming disparity thus was minimized. This standpoint was of course largely determined by traditional ideas of the inherent unity of divine revelation and the

general inerrancy of the inspired writers: it could not but be that Paul's interpretation of Jesus was the true one. But on the other side was a group of scholars, led by Wilhelm Bousset and Hermann Gunkel, who repudiated this dogmatic *a priori* completely and who sought to apply to the history of early Christianity the methods, already developed in other fields, of the comparative study of religions. Without denying that much in Paul was directly in line with Jesus' own teaching they argued that "Paulinism" as a whole is of multiple origin. Primitive Christianity, as they saw it, was a syncretism, in the composition of which Jesus and the religious tradition to which he belonged were important but not by any means the exclusive ingredients. In Pauline doctrine this syncretism they held, achieved a notable degree of coherence. The theory was not altogether novel; New Testament study was already acquainted with the idea that the theology of St Paul is not to be accounted for by the Dominical teaching alone and ought properly to be described as a synthesis of the gospel with a type of Judaism more or less foreign to the outlook of Jesus himself. It was even suggested that the two strains had modified if not materially altered the original evangelic message. The new *religionsgeschichtliche* school, however, went a good deal further than this. For it Paulinism was an amalgam of some very diverse elements and revealed that the springs of Christian doctrine may be looked for almost anywhere in the religious and cultural life of antiquity. The view was supported by many supposed analogies and resemblances, some far-fetched but others remarkable enough to merit serious attention.

The still lively controversy over the problem of the Dead Sea scrolls suggests indeed that the origins not only of Paulinism but of Christian beliefs generally are still in a number of respects obscure. For the scholarship of the opening decades of the present century it was the mystery-cults which appeared to offer the vital clue; but as we now look back on this particular phase in New Testament studies its hasty inferences and characteristic exaggerations seem only too obvious. The once eagerly canvassed Mandaean question, for example, is an illustration of what I mean. To-day little enough is heard of it, but thirty or more years ago it provided the critics with one of their leading themes. Here surely, it was claimed, is a piece of all-important evidence. Enthusiasm was eventually dampened, however, by the work of first Lietzmann and then Loisy. Yet some possibility remains, I think, as Bultmann has argued in his commentary

on the fourth gospel, that it is to a very early form of Mandaeanism, as we may perhaps venture to reconstruct it from the extant Mandaean writings—which themselves are not earlier than the eighth century—that a contributory source of primitive Christianity is to be traced. But the attempt to portray John the Baptist and even Jesus himself as adherents of the Mandaean sect—and much the same, though probably with more reason, has since been alleged of the Qumran community—had proved futile. Yet it is undeniable that certain Mandaean—and Essene—ideas, such as the antitheses of Light and Darkness and Truth and the Lie, clearly have their Christian counterparts, notably in the Johannine literature. What both alike point to is the existence at the beginning of the Christian era of a type of thought evidently wide-spread, if varying in its expression. That early Christian belief had its characteristic dualism is plain enough; and the study of the modes of such dualism elsewhere than in Christianity and by means of their differing terminologies can be of aid in interpreting the Christian dualism itself, with its fundamental opposition of the sovereignty of God and the dominion of Satan, of righteousness and light and sin and darkness.

Such a study has a special importance for the history of the primary development of Christianity inasmuch as the latter presents features which are, I believe, quite without parallel. The Christian religion arose in a Semitic environment, but after only a few years found itself in a strongly contrasting Hellenistic one; yet it was here that it first achieved real viability, since the later phases of Judean Christianity, at any rate after the fall of Jerusalem in A.D. 70, represent less a natural development than a gradual atrophy. Examples enough can be cited of religions which when transplanted—Buddhism is a case in point—have acquired new characteristics. But the Christianity of the early apostolic period was not so much a determinate growth as the mere seed of one. At the time of the founding of the first Gentile community at Antioch it still was in a very inchoate state; in neither cultus, nor doctrine, nor institutions had it reached more than tentative forms. In the general evolution of Christian thought the importance of this fact can hardly be over-rated, precisely because the removal of Christianity from a Semitic to a Hellenistic soil meant an essential change in the nature of its basic dualism. The Jewish, which it inherited, was temporal, opposing to the present world-order, under Satan's rule, another to come, under God's. The Hellenic, on the other hand, was ontological

and found expression in spatial images. Here the antithesis was not of present and future but of the mundane and the supramundane; between the material and perishable and the spiritual and immortal. The decline and eventual disappearance, to all practical intents, of the vivid eschatological hopes of the first Christian generation was of all developments in the initial stages of the Church's doctrinal evolution the most far-reaching. It is usual to attribute it to the pressure of Hellenistic influences. That it was of importance for the emergence of Paulinism is, I think, demonstrable; but Paul was not an extreme Hellenizer; if he occasionally made use of its language it was without committing himself to its philosophy.

The difference between Jewish and Greek modes of thought is plainly revealed in their respective anthropologies. The latter looks on the union of soul and body as a *mésalliance*, temporary only, of antithetical principles. The body is in fact the soul's prison-house, if not its tomb. The sooner therefore the soul is quit of it the better. The Jew, on the contrary, could not conceive of personality except through its corporal expression. Consequently Jewish and Greek expectations about the life beyond the grave are irreconcilable. For the one the hereafter means the spirit's liberation from material conditions entirely; for the other it necessitates a physical resurrection, even though the new body be a transformed and improved one. Thus Paul can speak of a "spiritual" body, a description which to a Greek could have little or no intelligible content. Paul's argument shows indeed not only how essentially Semitic his outlook was but what difficulty he had even in understanding the Greek view. The Corinthians who denied the resurrection of the dead did not, as he appears to imagine, negate the idea of *any* kind of life hereafter. Yet in a way Paul's mistake is our good fortune, since it has left us with an extended statement on an important and original aspect of the apostle's thought which otherwise we should not have had. But his words here and elsewhere are not without blame for the inconsistencies which have so often flawed Christian thinking about the life beyond.

True it is that Paul's doctrine offers us two distinct and by no means readily compatible beliefs. On the one hand he envisages a redemption to be completed by the resurrection of the dead at the Lord's return; on the other, the bliss of uninterrupted communion with the Saviour of all who die "in" him. The latter belief is clearly affirmed in the first chapter of Philippians, where the apostle con-



fesses his longing "to depart and be with Christ": "to die", he declares, "is gain". The wish is no merely world-weary disillusionment, but a positive and eager hope, an expectation of and longing for a life fuller and richer than anything that can be known here. These differences might at first seem explicable on the assumption that the growth of the apostle's faith had made it unthinkable for him that his fellowship with Christ could be broken, even by death itself. That the Epistle to the Philippians is a late writing would appear to support such a view. But the contrast in Paul's mind between a corporate eschatology of physical resurrection and an individual eschatology of spiritual communion is not to be accounted for simply by chronology. The two beliefs occupy his thoughts simultaneously, for in Philippians itself the declaration that "our commonwealth is in heaven", whence "we await a Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ, who will change our lowly body to be like his glorious body",<sup>3</sup> shows how the idea that salvation would be consummated only at and by the Parousia remained with him. Moreover the passage in 2 Corinthians which speaks of a growth of the believer's "inner nature" accompanying the progressive wasting away of his "outer"<sup>4</sup>—and Paul is undoubtedly referring here to an *individual* destiny—concludes with the solemn warning that "we must all appear before the judgement-seat of Christ, so that each one may receive good or evil, according to what he has done in the body",<sup>5</sup>—a conception which *per contra* can apply only within the framework of a collective eschatology.

It would be erroneous to see in this an inability on Paul's part to make up his mind about which of the two positions, the Greek or the Hebrew, to adopt. On any issue capable of being so stated he would have had no doubt. The only fruitful way of trying to understand his teaching is to investigate its origins. His collective or resurrection eschatology belonged to his Jewish inheritance, that of individual communion with the Risen Lord to his profoundly new experience as a Christian; and between these two there could be no question of an exclusive choice, although he equally was unable to unite them in a balanced synthesis. The facts of his personal experience were not to be contested; but neither on the other hand could he discard a received belief of the truth of which Christ's own resurrection was the certain pledge. Moreover a collective eschatology expressed something of importance for Christian faith, as he had come to hold it, which a purely individual hope did not: that the

end of redemption is corporate or communal, the deliverance from sin and death of God's *people* as such, and not a salvation merely of isolated individuals. But this only goes to prove that it is not to Hellenistic influences alone that we must attribute that gradual diminution of eschatological fervour which can be detected even in the first Christian generation and which in the second became pronounced. It resulted rather from the inner dynamism of the Christian conviction itself. The transformation, however, in turn undermined resistance to the effects of an environment now largely Gentile and pagan. That a continuous process of Hellenization is a factor essential to the interpretation of the formative stages of Christian theology is hardly to be denied. Harnack's great *Dogmengeschichte* had its faults, but his thesis—recalling that of Edwin Hatch's Hibbert Lectures of 1888—has not as a whole, I believe, been overthrown. Recently the learned Swiss theologian, Dr Martin Werner, has given us a new account of early Christian doctrine in which the key-term is not "acute Hellenization" but (though may the jargon be forgiven!) "de-eschatologization".<sup>6</sup> Yet it was this very de-eschatologization which made the Hellenizing process so much the easier. Werner's argument is, I would say, less a correction of Harnack's than a confirmation of it.

I conclude then that Paul's theology resulted in rendering Christianity far more susceptible to the growing pressure of Gentile ideas, but that it is not Gentile influence which establishes the real difference between his doctrine and the teaching of Jesus. Does this therefore imply that, as against the religio-historical school, the conservative scholars of forty or fifty years ago were after all right? By no means. The latter, we may think, had a stronger sense of the vital spiritual continuity that existed between Paul and Jesus and attached to it a greater significance. But where they failed was in paying insufficient attention to the disparity of milieu between Jesus' "Gospel of the Kingdom" and Paul's speculative theologizing. They were too ready to assume that any discrepancy was merely terminological.

Not that they were without excuse, since at that date it was still inadequately realized that the gospels themselves, as products of the second Christian generation, betray signs of the beliefs current at the period and in the circles which produce them; beliefs that had been coloured, in varying degree, by Paulinism itself. The nature of this *pre-synoptic* tradition has since been investigated by the

form-critics, who, despite their sometimes questionable methods and perhaps excessive historical scepticism, have at any rate made it clear that the gospel-material has a history antedating that of its literary embodiment.

## 3

We have already observed the tendency to treat the Dominical and Pauline teachings as strictly comparable. Here again excuse is not entirely wanting. The critical study of the Bible was begun, however fumblingly, in the atmosphere of eighteenth-century rationalism, and its motives were less scientific than polemical. Men like Semler and Reimarus were at odds with the arid Protestant scholasticism by which, in their sight, the simple religion of the gospels had been all but suffocated. But orthodox theologians saw in this view only a threat to the whole supernatural authority of Holy Writ. The effect of the controversy was to fix attention upon the doctrinal aspect of early Christianity to the exclusion of every other; even to-day we are apt to take it for granted that what the first Christian ages are known specifically to have taught is necessarily all that Christianity could have meant to them. But doctrine, important though it is, is not the full story; if it were, religion might be equated with philosophy. Christianity is and always has been vastly more than an intellectual system. The modern historian is in a better position to appreciate its historical complexity, and although the theological aspect has lost none of its compelling interest it is now recognized that others—the liturgical especially—are no less integral to a completed picture.

What then do we mean by Paulinism? Is it in fact capable of any exact definition? Than the great apostle there is, humanly speaking, no more fascinating figure in the Bible, and none more baffling. Somehow he eludes one's grasp even after years of study. It is therefore only tentatively that one ventures to summarize his characteristic teaching as his extant writings reveal it. But first, is it rightly to be described as a *theology*? Such it has repeatedly been called, whether in praise or blame. The answer depends of course on what the word is intended to mean. If it is to mean simply an exposition of the content of faith, then Paul's doctrine unquestionably is theological: the author of the chapters in Romans on justification, sanctification, and election, or of the passionate but tightly controlled argument of Galatians, was a theologian to his finger-tips.

If on the other hand theology is to imply not only rational reflection but precise and comprehensive systematization, then the term is inapplicable. Again and again the reader is left in the dark, or at least in an uncertain light, about issues of the greatest moment: the exact interpretation, for example, of the death of Christ and the manner of its efficacy; or the conditions of salvation; or the specific grounds of the writer's universalism and belief in the vocation of the Gentiles. On these and other matters his thought can shift and veer to the point of self-contradiction.

Paul's gospel rested, as he never doubted, upon a divine reality, of which it was the enunciation. This divine reality is the *event* of the Lord's Passion, an occurrence in time and place. The truth he proclaims therefore is no merely figurative or symbolic representation of a subjective experience; nor is it the synopsis of some supra-mundane drama the phases of which are reflected (but no more) in the world of human affairs. On the contrary, its *locus* is the historical life of man, to whom God's redemptive love has now been declared. It gives effect to a purpose by which God in his ineffable wisdom seeks to bring his creation to its perfect fulfilment and as the means thereto constitutes for himself a "holy people" of his own choice. The original realization of this purpose however was frustrated by the Fall. The Creator could no doubt have used his power to fashion a humanity automatically obedient to his will; but this would have added nothing to the divine glory. What on man's part God requires is a free and glad response; and the freedom hence conferred involved an inevitable risk. Yet despite the sin which would have merited, as the apostle seems to think, only a visitation of divine wrath upon the sinning race itself, God has extended his initial purpose in creating by willing also to *redeem*, the "agent" in redemption as in creation being his Son, Jesus Christ. For it was by the Son that, at the beginning, the old order of nature came into existence, represented by the carnal man, Adam; even as now he becomes the principle of a new order of grace wherein mankind passes from the carnal state to the spiritual. He it is in whom and by whom redemption is achieved and the wages of sin forfeited. "For as in Adam all die, so in Christ shall all be made alive."<sup>7</sup>

How did Paul come by this knowledge? Not, he was convinced, through any reflexion of his own; divine truth was beyond the reach of mere human searching. It had been revealed by God himself, through the Spirit. Even so, that gospel which Paul felt himself



seized on to preach not only to Jews but to Gentiles was something different again. It is not, he realizes, his task to expound an abstract rationale of the Father's intentions. For the apostle's clearly expressed mind upon this we have only to turn to 1 Corinthians. Here we learn that certain members of the Corinthian *ekklesia*—the following in all likelihood of the personable and eloquent Apollos—considered Paul's preaching to lack both style and persuasiveness. Paul himself admits the criticism: "I did not come, brethren, proclaiming to you the testimony of God in lofty words or wisdom . . . I decided to know nothing among you except Jesus Christ and him crucified."<sup>8</sup> Hence it is that his language and his message are not those of a learned and plausible orator, but—and we should note carefully his meaning—a "demonstration of the Spirit and power". It is not by its rational cogency that the gospel lays hold upon men's faith. To the Greeks, with whom the titillation of intellectual curiosity was almost a vice, this is absurdly disappointing: for them Christ crucified is foolishness. Paul reminds them however that the foolishness of God is wiser than men. The gospel comes primarily and, considering the universal weakness of the human condition, necessarily, as *power*; nevertheless for those who can receive it—the spiritual-minded—it too is wisdom, and a higher wisdom than the reasonings of the pundits. We must not of course try to wring from Paul's words a sense which they do not carry. He is not condemning the Corinthians outright. In Romans 8. 9 he declares that anyone lacking "the spirit of Christ" does not belong to him; but the Corinthian brotherhood was by no means devoid of proofs of its Spirit-possession: on the contrary they abounded and were even, for immature believers, a source of spiritual danger. Thus when Paul deplores the fact that the Corinthians are yet carnal and not spiritual we should not infer from their failure to attain the maturity which he had a right to expect of them that they had made no progress at all. The apostle's language is instructive: he uses the contrasting expressions *nepioi* and *teleioi*, "babes" who still can receive only milk and "adults" who can be given solid fare. *Teleios* is not, that is, to be taken in its usual meaning of "perfect" or "complete", since Paul disallows the possibility of the believer's ever reaching perfection under the conditions of this life. Moreover these terms are not the apostle's own coinage. He takes them—quite naturally, it seems—from the jargon of the pagan mystery-cults, with their idea of *degrees* of initiation. He thus can employ a word

like *teleios* and indeed describe himself by it ("Let those of us who are *teleioi* . . ." he says in Phil. 3. 15. Cf. 1 Cor. 2. 6; Col. 1. 28; 4. 12), even when he insists that there can be no complete and perfect *gnosis* so long as the consummation, the *teleion*, is undisclosed; which presumably it cannot be while the existing world-order lasts. That the Corinthians were still but babes instead of adults, carnal rather than spiritual, he censures as a grave defect; but he nowhere suggests that their salvation has been nullified.

The gospel for Paul lies, then, not in "wisdom", as a merely theoretical knowledge of the divine economy, but in power. It is "the *dunamis* of God for salvation to every one who has faith". He thus can have no reason to be ashamed of it. It is (as we now would say) an *existential* truth. For the neat dovetailing of arguments the hard-pressed apostle has simply no time. Mankind is on the brink of destruction and must be saved while there is yet the chance. His own God-ordained mission is to preach the power which alone will do it. Afterwards, when the vital work has been achieved, knowledge indeed can be built up; but at the moment the more urgent task awaits. Many perhaps there are who will never reach the goal of a full understanding, but such enlightenment as they are able to acquire will be enough so long as they lay hold of the redemption immediately offered them. It is doubtful whether Paul could ever have produced a theological blue-print of his teachings. The nearest thing we have to it—his great letter to the Romans—is something rather different.

Thus it is—and the point cannot, I think, be over-stressed—that the apostle's articulated doctrine, profound though it be, does not bring us to what for him is the very heart of the matter: his overwhelming sense of God's *action*. This shows itself above all in his idea of the "Spirit". What precisely he means by the word is not too easily stated. How, for example, are the respective connotations of "the Spirit", "Christ", "the Spirit of God" and "the spirit of Christ" to be differentiated in such a passage as Romans 8. 9-11? It would need a cunning exegete to do it to a nicety. But although we may not be able to turn Paul's often tumultuous language into the cut-and-dried formalism of a scholastic treatise the essential point and the pervading spirit of his utterance are seldom if ever in doubt. He means here that the question whether or not a man is "in Christ"—is a recipient, that is, of the benefits of Christ's redemptive work—is not in the first instance for him to determine; but once the option,

of spiritual life or death, is presented to him, decide he must. Herein surely lies the true significance of Paul's doctrine of predestination, so frequently misunderstood. What it expresses is his profound awareness that all he is, as both believer and apostle—and with it his hope of salvation—he owes in no way to himself, but to the divine prevenience alone. "It is by the grace of God that I am what I am." But, he adds, "the grace of God was not given me in vain."<sup>10</sup> It might have been: through indifference or hardness of heart he could have refused it.

## 4

The apostle's teaching does not, therefore, amount to a theological system. It is not abstract or schematic. Yet to a principle like that of justification by faith he attaches cardinal importance. To state what the essence of Paul's doctrine is demands, then, a delicate appreciation of the several currents of his thought. When, we might facetiously ask, is a theology not a theology? His convictions on justification he gives us at length and in detail; it is a theme on which his whole energy of mind is concentrated. But in other matters, no less integral to the truth to which his life and apostleship are dedicated, he can be tantalizingly vague. His interpretation of Christ's death is an example. The imagery he uses varies from the ritual to the legal and even the military: sometimes it is a Paschal or expiatory sacrifice; sometimes a substitutionary or representative punishment; now a victory over the powers of evil; now the final annulment of that Law under which the sinner is not saved but condemned. Nor is this diversity of explanation as touching a subject upon which the whole Pauline theology turns the only paradox of the kind. There is the thorny question of his apostleship itself. In Galatians he insists that his gospel and his apostolic vocation are alike of an origin exclusively divine. "The gospel which was preached by me is not man's gospel. For I did not receive it from man, nor was I taught it, but it came through a revelation of Jesus Christ."<sup>11</sup> "He who had set me apart before I was born, and had called me through his grace, was pleased to reveal his Son to me, in order that I might preach him among the Gentiles."<sup>12</sup> It is often asserted—and not without justice—that the sum of Paul's faith, and the whole bias of his theological outlook, sprang from the vision on the Damascus road. Certain qualifications must, however, be made. In the first place, momentous for him as his conversion

was, Paul retained a basic unity of view both as Jew and as Christian. To his former co-religionists his new doctrine was a scandal indeed, not least in its denunciation of the Law; but it was still essentially a *Jewish* doctrine. As Jew no less than as Christian he had been preoccupied with the question of the "justification" of the sinner at the judgement-seat of God on the last day. The ideas of sin, the righteousness of God, the office of Messiah, and divine revelation were fundamental. What conversion did mean for him was that the crucified Jesus, despite the terrible stumbling-block of Deuteronomy 21. 23, was now both "alive" and "glorified"—the very paradox which had from the beginning been proclaimed by his disciples and which Paul himself had once so bitterly denounced as a blasphemy. To acknowledge this necessitated a reconstruction of his entire creed; for Messiah's rôle had now to be recognized as first entailing his humiliation, even to the ignominy of death on the cross; only thereafter could he come again in glory to gather in the elect.

In the second place the vision on the Damascus road was not the only such experience. Paul's new life "in Christ" (or "in the Spirit") was to be marked by a series of these special revelations, covering his whole career. For his doctrine therefore, as for his personal authority, he might well have claimed no other basis than a private illumination. Yet whatever novelty that doctrine showed, it is clear that he did not regard himself as in any sense at all the originator of a new faith. He had become a *Christian*—an adherent of a religion already, in its fundamentals, in being, and on no account could he break with those who held the essential principles he himself now shared, even when his fellow-Christians misunderstood or misrepresented his own apostolic message.

The idea of schism was abhorrent to him, abhorrent not only as causing a grievous practical embarrassment in his missionary work, but for a deeper reason still. Here we touch the heart of Paul's conception of what the gospel involves. Christ, he felt, had laid hold of him, had made him his own.<sup>13</sup> He now was Christ's property, like a slave; Christ was his "Lord". But who was Christ? No other, he is convinced, than a pre-existent divine being who notwithstanding had chosen to live on earth the life of a man, and who, having in his profound humility accepted the final consequences of this self-emptying, was worthy indeed to be called *Kyrios*. Christ's agency, which had been manifested even in the creation, would extend



across time to that *telos* whereat he would deliver the kingdom to God the Father after destroying "every rule and every authority and power".<sup>14</sup> Within this vast cosmic plan his assumption of humanity was far more than a brief and isolated episode, since by it the work of human redemption was actually accomplished. Yet Paul, a contemporary and an apostle of this same Lord, had *not* been a witness of his earthly life. He knew only what he had learned from others, upon whose teaching he therefore was dependent, if not for the assurance of his faith at least for its content. "I delivered to you", he writes to his Corinthian converts, "as of first importance what I also received, that Christ died for our sins in accordance with the scriptures, that he was buried, that he was raised on the third day in accordance with the scriptures."<sup>15</sup> This was still the Good News, and nothing—other than its inherent implications, upon which he was called to insist—could be added to it.

Paul's doctrine thus had its roots in tradition even more than in personal inspiration. Yet this being so is it not remarkable, to say the least, that specific references to the gospel history should be so rare? No doubt it is; but too much should not be built on the fact. Had we only the epistles of St Paul to rely on we certainly would know little of Jesus' historic life. But reading between the lines a good deal more can be discerned than appears on the surface. Also we must allow for the strict limitations of the epistolary form; letters are not systematic treatises. The apostle was writing to groups of people who had already been instructed in at any rate the rudiments of Christianity; and it was no part of his task to recapitulate this teaching. All he sought to do was to enlarge his readers' knowledge or clarify their understanding on this point or that, whether of faith or of morals. They possessed the necessary groundwork; what he now had to tell them could rest upon it. We unfortunately are without such immediate commentary on the apostle's statements, so that often his meaning is less clear to us than it would have been to those to whom his words were first addressed. But in view of what he says at the beginning of 1 Corinthians 15 there is no reason to doubt that his basic instruction followed closely the teaching he had himself received. In this particular instance his own testimony is offered last.

The fact, however, that Paul does attach so much weight to a tradition of *events* proves that for him the gospel was not simply a

scheme of ideas. God, he had come to believe, had acted even in the most recent history of his people, and the culminating moment of this action had been Jesus' death and resurrection. It was to this tradition that his own special witness, the fruit of a personal revelation, had now to be added: his conversion was itself God's doing. But how are the two sources of faith to be related? The question admits, it must be said, of no very simple answer. In the first place Paul's experience is not to be taken merely as a signal instance of a common type; it must be studied *per se* and not only in the light of other "conversions"—Luther's, for example—which apparently resemble it and about which we have fuller information. The German friar had already been through great mental tribulation caused by a gnawing sense at once of personal sin and of failure to gain assurance of forgiveness from the customary resources of Catholic piety. Then suddenly the truth of the saying, "The just shall live by faith",<sup>16</sup> struck home to him. Confidence returned and his fears melted away. But with St Paul it is almost the reverse that takes place. Before conversion he was conscious of being blameless "as to righteousness under the Law";<sup>17</sup> and for a Jew so convinced there could have been no doubt of salvation. The sense of failure and unworthiness in the apostle's case comes only *after* the great crisis and in the course of the new life itself: "For", he poignantly complains, "I do not do the good I want, but the evil I do not want is what I do."<sup>18</sup> Being justified by faith, he verily had "peace with God"; but not necessarily with himself. The two experiences differ, I believe, markedly, and one should not be invoked in simple explanation of the other. Nor was Paul's conversion "sudden" in that it was unprepared; though he may well have been less than fully aware of the preparatory process going on in his mind.

## 5

It is only when we have thus formed some idea of what Paul's doctrine is and have taken account of the conditions which shaped his beliefs, that we are in a position to understand why the relation between that doctrine and the gospel of Jesus cannot be shown by the simple method of cataloguing the points of resemblance and divergence. Paul's whole outlook differs from that of his Master in that he has somehow to interpret the extraordinary and profoundly challenging fact of Calvary. He cannot see things as the Victim himself saw them. How Jesus looked on his passion is of

course a question to be broached only in the most tentative manner. The difficulty is that the gospels do not give us his own mind but the representation of it projected by the faith of second generation Christians whose ideas were themselves a reflection of Pauline influence.<sup>19</sup> For the evangelists Jesus came on earth in order, by his death, to effect the redemption of the human race. His message had indeed been ill-received; the bulk of the people disregarded him, the religious leaders opposed him. The upshot of this hostility was his arrest and trial before the Roman procurator, leading to his condemnation and death by crucifixion. But these events, in the evangelists' eyes, are no mere sequence of cause and effect as a modern historian would present it. They are the unfolding of God's purpose, and so fore-ordained. Jesus' persecutors knew it not, but he himself was aware from the beginning of his ministry whither its course must lead, and why. Nor did he ever imagine that the nation as a whole would respond to his preaching. The "secrets of the kingdom" were imparted only to a small band of close associates; for the multitude the parables sufficed. It thus was necessary because, according to the evangelists, divinely decreed, that "the Son of man must suffer many things, and be rejected by the elders and chief priests and scribes, and be killed"<sup>20</sup>—a death which can be described, in words which St Mark attributes to Jesus, as "a ransom for many". Hence if, at the end, he goes up to Jerusalem it is simply because "it cannot be that a prophet should perish away from Jerusalem".<sup>21</sup>

But this picture of events gives them a new and artificial perspective. A single illustration will show how. In the synoptic gospels Jesus' ministry at Jerusalem was of a few days' duration only—less than a week according to St Mark—and is to be regarded as no more than the necessary preliminary to the final scene of the whole drama. Could he in that time, beset as he was by his opponents, have accomplished anything in the way of winning new disciples and instructing them? Yet if the testimony of Acts is authentic his Jerusalem mission was in this respect by no means unsuccessful. Soon after the ascension—"in those days"—Peter addresses a company of the "brethren" numbering in all about one hundred and twenty persons.<sup>22</sup> If this figure includes the fifteen or twenty who accompanied him from Galilee, then the Jerusalem converts must have been as many as a hundred. This alone suggests that the Lord's stay in the Holy City must have been longer than the

gospel narrative allows; as long as two or three months perhaps. That Jesus himself foresaw his death is not to be doubted. His words were bound to evoke the jealous enmity of the Jewish authorities; and what was already manifest in provincial Galilee would certainly not be less so in the capital. A disturbance there, moreover, would inevitably move the imperial power to take action. Indeed it is more than probable that there never was a time when Jesus did not feel the danger to himself inherent in the challenge which his message carried, and as the months passed and report of him spread abroad the risks grew. But of the imperative nature of his mission he had no doubt; and all things were in his Father's hand. If suffering, even violent death, were to await him, it simply was what, in the providence of God, the advent of the Kingdom must require. The conviction thus dawned upon him that not only was he the herald of that Kingdom but, by willing acceptance of suffering, was himself to be its inaugurator. Should death supervene he yet would "return" alive as Son of Man. In the prospect of his passion he measured the height of his messianic vocation.

Neither the evangelists' view, which sees in the history of Jesus the conscious working-out of a divine plan, nor its opposite, for which the cross is only an accident that had in no way entered into his calculations, is therefore true to the facts. Jesus went up to Jerusalem fully realizing what the consequences of his so doing might be and ready to accept them should the purpose of God demand it. This however is not at all to say that he himself regarded his passion as an efficacious sacrifice, an atonement for sin. It was enough that he should obey his Father's will. But with St Paul the Lord's death on the cross is the essence of the matter. The main stumbling-block has become the heart of the mystery, the very thing which gives to the gospel the cutting-edge of its meaning.

Does the New Testament contain, then, not one but two "gospels"? The answer, on the face of it, must be yes, and that they are not to be confused. But a more pertinent question is whether the *Evangelium de Christo*—that of the saving power of the cross—is a perversion of the *Evangelium Christi*—Jesus' own proclamation of the imminent Kingdom of God. The liberal theology of fifty or sixty years ago maintained that it is. The modern believer was invited—as, for example, by Adolf Harnack in his popular volume *What is Christianity?*—to choose between Jesus and Paul, the one or the other. To-day this simple antithesis is seen, I think, no longer



to be valid. The gospel *about* Christ is, rather, the sole natural and proper outcome of the gospel *of* Christ, after Christ himself had gone to his death in its service. The proclamation of the Kingdom, in its original form, was an eschatological myth; and any modern counterpart thereto, conceived in temporal terms, would be no more than the programme of some "new order", meliorist or revolutionary, of man's own invention. But for Christian witness to-day the Gospel of Jesus must be that of the crucified Lord. It is therefore not merely idle but obtuse to blame the apostle for his supposed theological complication of a simple truth, since to distinguish the Teacher from the Saviour is to destroy the unity of the Church's message and hence to falsify it. *The Evangelium Christi* has certainly not ceased to have meaning, and for some indeed will always have a special force of appeal; but the *Evangelium de Christo* has proved its efficacy in Christian experience from age to age. Church doctrine must retain the two. Complementary, they are mutually necessary.

<sup>1</sup> Mark 2. 10 and parallels.      <sup>2</sup> Mark 10. 45. Cf. Matt. 20. 28.

<sup>3</sup> 3. 20.      <sup>4</sup> 4. 16.      <sup>5</sup> 5. 10.

<sup>6</sup> See his *Die Entstehung des christlichen Dogmas*, 2 Ausg., Bern, 1954. The abridged English version by Dr S. G. F. Brandon, with the title *The Formation of Christian Dogma*, was published in 1957.

<sup>7</sup> 1 Cor. 15. 22.      <sup>8</sup> 2. 1f.      <sup>9</sup> Rom. 1. 16.      <sup>10</sup> 1 Cor. 15. 10.

<sup>11</sup> 1. 11f.      <sup>12</sup> 1. 15f.      <sup>13</sup> Phil. 3. 12.      <sup>14</sup> 1 Cor. 15. 24.

<sup>15</sup> 15. 3f.

<sup>16</sup> Rom. 1. 17: Better, "He who through faith is righteous shall live."

<sup>17</sup> Phil. 3. 6.      <sup>18</sup> Rom. 7. 19.

<sup>19</sup> That the Paulinism of the gospels is the pure doctrine is not to be said; it is only a popularized and adulterated version of it; but the imprint of the apostle's thinking is there all the same.

<sup>20</sup> Mark 8. 31. Cf. Matt. 16. 21; Luke 9. 22.

<sup>21</sup> Luke 13. 33.      <sup>22</sup> Acts 1. 15.

# JUDAISM IN EGYPT—A.D. 70-135

L. W. BARNARD

THE period from the fall of Jerusalem to the Bar-Kochba rising (A.D. 70-135) was one of crucial significance for Egyptian Judaism. During these years Hellenistic Judaism, which had produced so much noble literature and had made such a sustained effort to bridge the gulf between the Jewish and Greek worlds, virtually ceased to exist as an effective force, and the Christian Church and Gnosticism became its heirs. After A.D. 135, although Jewish communities continued to exist, Judaism never again rose to pre-eminence and Jews did not play even a minor rôle in Alexandrian politics until the fourth century A.D. The story of this intellectual and religious decline has never been written owing to the paucity of evidence, from the Jewish side, for this transition period. After Philo there exists an unfortunate blank in our knowledge of the beliefs and literary activity of Alexandrian Judaism. We shall hope to show in this article that the situation is not so serious as has often been assumed and that from a Christian source it is possible to show the probable course that at least one section of Alexandrian Judaism took. But first we must trace the historical background of the Jewish communities.

## *Historical Background*

Jewish settlements existed in Egypt from early times, one of the first being at Elephantiné, the ancient Yeb, an island on the Nile in Upper Egypt. There a Jewish community in the sixth century B.C. developed a curious kind of religious syncretism which embraced the worship of Yahweh under the name of Yahu or Yaho<sup>1</sup> with that of other gods and goddesses including Anathyahu,<sup>2</sup> who was regarded as Yahweh's bride. However, we gain the impression, from the sporadic references which have come down, that before the time of Ptolemy I Jewish settlements were few and that no mass migrations had taken place. The position changed somewhat from the time of Alexander the Great, who, according to Josephus,<sup>3</sup> incorporated Jews among the citizens of the new city of Alexandria; later they came to enjoy special privileges and had their own quarter. By the beginning of the Christian era the Alexandrian Jews had so multiplied that they were the largest Jewish community

outside Judaea and, according to Philo,<sup>4</sup> constituted about two fifths of the city's population, occupying two of the five city divisions. There were, however, no ghettos, and some Jews lived scattered among the Graeco-Egyptian population where they had their own synagogues for worship and religious instruction. Philo also reckoned that the total Jewish population in Egypt was, in his day, about a million, which may be considered to be confirmed by the many references to their existence in Lower, Middle, and Upper Egypt which have been found.<sup>5</sup> The same author's remark that the Jews had their dwellings "as far as the borders of Ethiopia" is not necessarily an exaggeration on present knowledge.<sup>6</sup>

The diaspora, united as it was by a bond of loyalty to its Palestinian home, was a permanent problem to the Roman authorities. Everywhere the Jews aroused suspicion among the native population on account of their ritual practices, abstention from local social activities, refusal to join in the official worship of the locality, and strange diet. The Romans tried in earnest to respect the rights of minorities, and the Jews were not slow to take advantage of this toleration. They appealed immediately and without hesitation to the governing power whenever they suffered hostile acts or adverse decisions from local magistrates, and more often than not the Romans, as a matter of general policy, intervened in their favour. It was Julius Caesar who, as a reward for services rendered in his Egyptian campaign, gave the Jews a unique juridical status, i.e. freedom of assembly for worship, the right to collect offerings for the Jerusalem Temple, exemption from military service, and a recognition of their corporate existence according to the traditions of their fathers. The amicable relationship which existed between the Roman power and the Egyptian Jews, coupled with the consciousness that the Jews were strangers from afar, tended to embitter the non-Jewish population. Moreover the exemption which they enjoyed from the jurisdiction of the Greek courts no doubt caused discontent, and to this was added Jewish exclusiveness, intolerance, and consciousness of racial superiority. The wealth and commercial ability possessed by some members of the Alexandrian community, such as Alexander the Alabarch, Philo's brother, the Rothschild of his age, simply added fuel to the flames. These were the causes of that deep hatred of the Jews which became evident in the Egyptian metropolis and has continued unabated to the present day. The foundation of the Zionist state of Israel in 1948, under the

auspices of the United Nations, was, for the Egyptians, a cause of fear and dread which has deep roots in history.

Antipathy towards the Egyptian Jews took no violent form during the Ptolemaic period. However, after the fall of Anthony and Cleopatra relationships began to take on a more sombre aspect when Octavian, with significant lack of tact, confirmed the Jews in their privileges at the very time when he was refusing the Alexandrians the senate for which they had asked. From this time Greek-Jewish hostility became more marked and a nationalist anti-Jewish literature began to appear. During the reign of the Roman Emperor Caligula a collision occurred which was to have not insignificant consequences.<sup>7</sup> This happened in the spring of A.D. 38 when Herod Agrippa, the notorious spendthrift son of Herod the Great, set out from Rome surrounded by an escort of soldiery with the intention of calling at Alexandria *en route* for Palestine. The local Jews decided to make his visit the triumphal entrance of their ruler. This greatly embittered the Greek population, who retaliated by dressing up a local idiot to resemble Agrippa and insulting him with coarse wit and shouts of *Marin*, the Syrian word for Lord—an added “insult” in view of Agrippa’s Syrian origin.<sup>8</sup> The Greeks then demanded that the Jews should pay divine honours to Caligula, who had been deified, insisting that his statue should be set up in their synagogues. A riot followed in which Jewish shops and houses were plundered in the traditional eastern manner, many Jews being slaughtered in the streets. Flaccus, the weak Roman Governor, did nothing to stop the pogrom, and the unfortunate survivors were huddled together in a ghetto in the delta quarter of the city, although later, when the Emperor heard about the incident, Flaccus was condemned to death. On the Alexandrian side there were some trials in the imperial courts, and a whole patriotic literature, the *Acta Alexandrinorum*, grew up around the local heroes who are represented as treating the Emperor with great boldness and courage. The Alexandrians came to cherish the memory of their martyrs as much as the Jews and Christians that of their own. This pogrom had a great effect upon the imagination of the Jews, who swore vengeance for the outrage which had been committed. Embassies were sent to other Jewish centres, with the result that armed reinforcements flocked into the Egyptian capital. Claudius’ command to the Jews<sup>9</sup> “not to introduce or invite Jews who sail down from Syria or Egypt, thus compelling me to conceive the



greater suspicion; otherwise I shall by all means take vengeance on them as fomenting a general plague for the whole world" may conceivably refer to these reinforcements. The Jewish communities were, however, by no means united within themselves and internal strife reared its ugly head, if we may judge by the embassies which two factions sent to Claudius concerning an unknown matter.

Further conflicts between Jew and Greek took place in Alexandria in A.D. 53,<sup>10</sup> and at the time of the Jewish war against Rome during the years A.D. 66-70 when the cry of "spies" was raised against the Jews.<sup>11</sup> After the destruction of the Temple in A.D. 70 a number of fugitives came from Jerusalem to Alexandria and sought to stir up trouble against the Romans, which the orthodox leaders resisted. In the ensuing turmoil these revolutionaries put to death certain of the orthodox leaders. However, their success was short lived, for the Jewish Gerousia soon crushed the faction, taking some six hundred prisoners in the process. Another clash between Jews and Greeks took place in A.D. 110 when the Jews appear to have had the ear of Trajan. The position was reversed in A.D. 115 when the Egyptian Jews arose against this Emperor<sup>12</sup> (when he was engaged in his Parthian war), as part of a concerted movement of revolt which had its origin in Cyrene. This brought more strife to Alexandria, where a terrible conflict took place with the Greek population in which the Jews suffered heavy losses. During this period, as we shall see later, relations between Jews and Christians of Jewish descent also worsened and violent feeling was aroused. After A.D. 135 the Egyptian communities declined in influence, and eventually St Cyril of Alexandria expelled the Jews *en masse* from the metropolis after some seven centuries' existence in the city.

This historical background has been dwelt on at some length because it is indispensable for the understanding of the path which Egyptian Judaism took in the little-known period from A.D. 70-135. Strife between Jew and Greek, between Jew and Jew, and Jew and Christian, often accompanied by violent massacres and upheavals, formed the political background of the age. It was in such a setting as this that Hellenistic Judaism of the philosophic type, which had sought to present Jewish ideas in Greek dress and to provide a bridge between the Graeco-Oriental and Jewish worlds, gradually disappeared. It was, however, destined to survive as a living force within the Christian Church, where it later flowered in the writings of Clement and Origen. Gnosticism and the Hermetic writings, to judge

from recent work on this subject,<sup>13</sup> also laid their claim to its treasures.

### *Developments in Judaism*

The problem presented by the eclipse of Philo and Jewish philosophical speculation is of signal importance for the path that Egyptian Judaism took in this period. Why was it that Philo's works, to say the least, were not preserved by the Jews?<sup>14</sup> It is of course possible that this great thinker was never typical of Alexandrian Judaism as a whole, perhaps representing only a small philosophically minded circle—although it is an interesting fact that in one place<sup>15</sup> Philo is concerned to combat Jews who carried his allegorical method to the extreme of denying altogether the relevance of the *Torah* to their faith, an indication of the existence of a Jewish group or groups who yielded even more than he did to an accommodation to current thought. However, the main reason for the eclipse of Philo was the resurgence of Pharisaic Judaism, which began at Jamnia after A.D. 70 and continued unabated, in its literary activity, until about A.D. 600. The Rabbis looked with disfavour on the attempt which had been made in Alexandria to bridge the gulf between the Jewish and Greek worlds and gradually exerted their influence against this. Thus Judaism, which earlier had been of a varied character wherein, both in Palestine and in the diaspora, Pharisaic, Hellenistic, and sectarian beliefs existed side by side, now slowly conformed to the path of Rabbinism. However, this change of emphasis was not effected immediately upon the reconstruction of Judaism at Jamnia, as the text books used to suggest. There was in Palestine and the diaspora a transition period, covered approximately by the years A.D. 70-135, during which Hellenistic and Rabbinic ideas continued to exist side by side in Greek documents and the linguistic frontier between the Greek and Semitic worlds had not yet been identified with the cultural frontiers between Hellenism and Judaism. It is the merit of Professor G. D. Kilpatrick's outstanding work on St Matthew's Gospel that this fact is recognized and given full weight.<sup>16</sup> He shows that in Matthew we have a Greek document whose thought is closely connected with, and is evidence for, the Rabbinical Judaism of the end of the first century A.D. and, more recently, Professor K. Stendahl<sup>17</sup> has provided evidence that this Gospel was produced within a school of exegetes who worked on the lines of the Rabbinical schools attached to the synagogues.

Rabbinical Judaism in Syria, if Matthew had its origin there, was a force to be reckoned with in this transition period. However, when we turn to Egypt it has usually been said that evidence for the beliefs of the Jewish communities in this period, from both Jewish and Christian sides, is totally lacking and that therefore it is impossible to gain any clear view as to their development or otherwise. *A priori* we should expect in the years A.D. 70-135 the Hellenistic element in Egyptian Judaism to decline and the Pharisaic to rise to the ascendancy as the influence of Jamnia was exerted.

We wish to suggest that one piece of evidence has been overlooked for the understanding of Egyptian Judaism in this period. This is the Christian document known as the Epistle of Barnabas, which is usually classed with the writings of the Apostolic Fathers of the Church. Barnabas, an epistolary tract of unknown Jewish-Christian authorship, was probably written in Alexandria during the early years of the reign of Hadrian (A.D. 117-138),<sup>18</sup> and its significance for us lies in the fact that its arguments are so thoroughly Jewish that the specifically Christian elements are pushed into the background. Bishop Lightfoot<sup>19</sup> said that the writer treats the Jewish scriptures with a degree of respect which would have satisfied the most devout Rabbi. If this is the case, we may have first hand evidence for the beliefs of at least one section of Alexandrian Judaism in the early decades of the second century A.D., just before the triumph of Pharisaism.

We may give briefly the arguments for regarding the author as a converted Rabbi who brought into Christianity the exegetical and homiletic traditions of the Alexandrian synagogue. The first is the strongly Jewish character of the Epistle's argument and its familiarity with Jewish rites. We may mention also the designation of Satan as the Black one (4. 9; 20. 1),<sup>20</sup> the invisibility of God (5. 10),<sup>21</sup> the land of milk and honey (6. 8), the ritual of the Day of Atonement (7. 1-11),<sup>22</sup> the shrub "Rachel" (7. 8), the sacrifice of the red heifer (8. 1-2), the "Kingdom of Jesus on the wood" (8. 5), the gematria on the 318 servants of Abraham (9. 8),<sup>23</sup> the interpretation of Psalm 1 (10. 10),<sup>24</sup> Moses and Amalek (12. 1-11),<sup>25</sup> Jacob and Esau (13. 1-7), the celebration of the sabbath (15. 1-9),<sup>26</sup> and the allegorical interpretation of the six days of the creation as the 6,000 years of the world's history (15. 4). However, it is the author's exegetical method which, for our purpose, is of the greatest interest.

(a) This is strongly Rabbinic: this is shown by the division made

by the author into Haggadah (ch. 1-17) and Halakhah (ch. 18-20), and by the fact that the Epistle as a whole is a Talmud, i.e. *didache*. Thus in 9. 9, immediately following the bold gematria on Abraham's servants, come these words: *Oiden ho ten emphuton dorean tes didaches autou themenos en hemin. Oudeis gnosiateron emathen ap' emou logon; alla oida, hoti axioi este humeis*. And in 16. 9 the author says that God dwells in us by *ho logos autou tes pisteos, he klesis autou tes epaggelias, he sophia ton dikaiomaton, hai entolai tes didaches*. The division between the Haggadic and Halakhic sections of the Epistle is marked by the words, *Metabomen de kai epi heteran gnosin kai didachen* (18. 1). Moreover passages from the LXX are broken into their component parts and explained piece by piece, as in the rabbinical method of writing midrash (a good example of this is chapter 4); it is this method which largely accounts for the lack of unity and the presence of *membra disjecta* in the Epistle. Indeed some of the writer's interpretations have close parallels in rabbinical exegesis. Thus the belief that the Jews fell from grace when Moses broke the tables of stone at Sinai (4. 8, 14. 3) is also found in a tradition in Mekilta, and the subject is further discussed in the Talmudic Aboda Zarah 4<sup>b</sup>-5<sup>a</sup>. There was a Jewish fast day on Tammuz 17 which commemorated the dark day of the golden calf incident. Another indication of the Epistle's rabbinical style is the author's fondness for the rhetorical question, a didactic device much used by the rabbis. These considerations suggest that the Alexandrian synagogue, in which the author was nurtured before his conversion, knew and practised in the early second century A.D. a type of exegesis and homiletic exposition closely parallel in many ways to that of the Rabbis of Jamnia. The only difference was that this exegesis was somewhat more free than that of Palestinian Rabbinism, being based on the Greek Bible as a whole and on certain of the pseudepigraphical writings. As yet the school associated with Rabbi Akiba, with its passion for minute accuracy and devotion to the letter of the Hebrew text, which reflected badly on the frequent loose phraseology of the Greek version, had been unable to prevent the use of the LXX in the Hellenistic synagogues of Alexandria. In Egypt the LXX probably ceased to be copied by Jews at a slightly later date than that of this Epistle.

(b) *Allegorical Interpretation*. It is a well-known fact that the Epistle adopts *in toto* the allegorical method of interpretation. Examples may be picked at random, the most striking being in 9. 8



where Abraham's 318 servants are made to refer to Jesus and the Cross ( $IHT=318$ ). The writer's usual procedure is to break up passages from the LXX into their component parts, as in the Rabbinical midrashim, and then explain them allegorically. His use of this method far exceeds anything known in Rabbinical Judaism and the New Testament, where it is used only with the greatest caution, and in none of the passages classified by Dr C. H. Dodd as primary sources of *testimonia*.<sup>27</sup> We are therefore justified in believing that the writer knew of this method from the teaching of the Hellenistic synagogue before his conversion. Philo's type of allegorization must therefore still have been practised in Alexandria in the early second century A.D. although it may have been used only to serve the purposes of midrashic exposition.

(c) *The Pesher Method*. Embedded in the Epistle's rabbinical mode of thought is a method of interpreting the Old Testament which has been found in the Qumran Scrolls. This is the quotation of an O.T. text followed by an application to contemporary events—an interpretation which was believed to have a profound significance for those who could understand. Thus Barn. 5. 3-4 reads:

Therefore we ought to give hearty thanks to the Lord that he has given us knowledge of the past, and wisdom for the present, and that we are not without understanding for the future. And the Scripture says, "Not unjustly are the nets spread for the birds". This means that a man deserves to perish who has a knowledge of the way of righteousness, but turns aside into the way of darkness.

Barn. 16. 3-4:

Furthermore he says again, "Lo, they who destroyed this temple shall themselves build it". That is happening now. For owing to the war it was destroyed by the enemy; at present even the servants of the enemy will build it up again.

This method of interpretation is reminiscent of that found in the Qumran commentaries on the Books of Micah, Nahum, Habakkuk, and Psalm 37, and in the Damascus Document. E.g., with the first passage quoted above may be compared Com. Ps. 37. 8-9 (fragment A col. 1): "Refrain from anger and abandon wrath; fret not thyself, it tendeth only to evil doing. For evildoers shall be cut off! This applies to those who return to the *Torah* and do not refuse to repent their evil-doing. Those, however, who are defiant about repenting their iniquity will be cut off." With the second compare 4 Qp. Nah.

2. 11: "Where is the abode of the lions, which was the feeding place of the young lions. [This refers to Jerusalem which has become] an abode for the wicked men of the heathen." Barnabas' use of this method recalls the Qumran word *peshar*, used frequently in these commentaries to indicate the interpretation of texts, the true significance and application of which is only known by those who possess understanding. Professor Stendahl<sup>28</sup> has plausibly connected the *peshar* type of citation with the formula quotations of St Matthew's Gospel, and it could be argued that Barnabas took over this method from there. However the fact that his interpretations never refer to the fulfilment in our Lord, and the close parallel with the Qumran citations, suggest that the method may have been already known in the Alexandrian Judaism in which he was cradled.

(d) *The Religious Life*: In this Epistle the distinctive Christian virtues of faith, hope, and love play a subordinate rôle, the main emphasis of the writer being on spirituality (4. 11, 16. 10) and upon knowledge, (*gnosis*) which is used in three senses:

(i) Knowledge is often coupled with faith and has ethical consequences (1. 5, 5. 4, 18. 1, 19. 1).

(ii) Sometimes this knowledge refers to the interpretation of events in the past, present, and eschatological future (2. 3-4; 5. 3).

(iii) Knowledge is also mediated through the allegorical interpretation of the O.T. (6. 9; 13. 7) and is also the gift of God (1. 7; 9. 8).

This idea of knowledge is not that of Gnosticism, where it refers to the comprehension of the soul's origin and nature by a mystical enlightenment, but is fundamentally Jewish. This is shown by the marked affinities which the connotation of knowledge in Barnabas has with the idea of *da'ath* in the Qumran texts, where it also has a strong ethical content<sup>29</sup> and an eschatological reference.<sup>30</sup> However, as W. D. Davies<sup>31</sup> points out, the emphasis which the Dead Sea sect placed on *da'ath*, in comparison with other Jewish literature, may well reflect, in a subtle way, Hellenistic influences which had been entering Palestine since the Maccabaeon period. It is therefore possible that the emphasis upon knowledge in Barnabas, while fundamentally Jewish,<sup>32</sup> also owed something to the Hellenistic milieu of Alexandria, where the idea of knowledge formed part of the intellectual climate of the age.

While no claim is made that the Jewish background of this Epistle necessarily represents the whole of Alexandrian Judaism in the early decades of the second century A.D., it is at least evidence which deserves to be taken into consideration. It shows that, in certain Jewish circles, some Hellenistic influences and ideas, parallel to those found on Palestinian soil at Qumran, continued to exist side by side with Rabbinic conceptions. However the Rabbinical caste of thought and exegetical methods are clearly central to the Epistle's arguments and overlay these other influences. It therefore appears that in the crucial period A.D. 70-135 Alexandrian Judaism, while having affinities on one side with Philonic allegorism and other Hellenistic modes of thought, was slowly conforming to the pattern and requirements of Rabbinism which, no doubt, had been exerting pressure on diaspora Judaism.<sup>33</sup> The triumph of Pharisaism had, however, not yet fully come.

### *The Struggle with Christianity*

We have already seen that strife between Jew and Greek reached ugly proportions during this period. In particular the terrible losses suffered by the Alexandrian Jewish community following on the revolt against Trajan in A.D. 115 must have had serious consequences. A time of political upheaval such as this would not have been conducive to consolidation, and Egyptian Judaism slowly began to decline in influence. However, in the period from A.D. 70-135 the Jews were still a force in Egypt, and we must now study their relations *vis-à-vis* the Christian Church.

As is well known the origins of Egyptian Christianity are bathed in obscurity. It has been suggested<sup>34</sup> that in origin it was of Gnostic character and that this accounts for the silence of later orthodox writers. There is no real evidence to substantiate this view—especially in view of the fact that Basilides and Valentinus now appear to have been more Christian and less Gnostic than previously thought.<sup>35</sup> Again, our earliest certain evidence for Christianity in Egypt is the Epistle of Barnabas, c. A.D. 120, which has behind it a long tradition of worship, catechesis, and liturgy,<sup>36</sup> and presupposes the use of St Matthew's Gospel and several of the New Testament epistles. Moreover the use of an earlier Two Ways catechesis in this work, almost certainly Jewish-Christian, suggests that Christians of Jewish descent existed in Egypt at an earlier period. We may also believe that Gentiles formed an element in the Church, as the earliest

Christian Gnostics, who appear in the reign of Hadrian, could hardly have arisen *in vacuo*. Basilides in particular had behind him earlier Christian speculations. There is also some evidence for a connection between the Roman and Egyptian Churches at an early period which was, no doubt, facilitated by trading contacts between the ports of Puteoli and Alexandria. Quite apart from Eusebius' reference to St Mark, the historical value of which is disputed,<sup>37</sup> we have the recognition of the connection by Julius I,<sup>38</sup> the similarity between the Canons adopted by the two Churches and the readings found in the Sahidic version of the New Testament which are also found in Codex D and in the old Latin versions. It appears probable that both Jewish and Gentile Christians were to be found in Egypt in the first century A.D., and perhaps the Roman Church had taken a share in bringing the new faith to the country.

Relations between Jews and Christians during the period A.D. 70-135 took on a more sombre aspect. From the Christian side we have the evidence of the Gospels of St Matthew, St John, and the Apocalypse,<sup>39</sup> i.e. evidence from Syria and Asia Minor, which shows that antagonism was most marked where Christians were of Jewish descent. This is also supported by explicit statements from Jewish sources which have been collected by Professor Kilpatrick<sup>40</sup> who quotes, as the most informative piece of evidence, the *Birkath-ha-Minim* composed by Samuel the Small at Jamnia c. A.D. 85. In its earliest form it reads: "For the excommunicate let there be no hope and the arrogant government do thou swiftly uproot in our days; and may the Christians and heretics suddenly be laid low and not be inscribed with the righteous. Blessed art thou, O Lord, who humbles the arrogant." This insertion in the liturgy henceforth made it impossible for Christians of Jewish descent to attend the synagogue,<sup>41</sup> as undoubtedly some of them had done up to that time, and the breach was made absolute before A.D. 100 by the sending out of letters from Palestine to all synagogues informing them of the necessity of excluding Christians from their assemblies. Further evidence of the persecution measures taken by Judaism is provided by a statement in Justin Martyr which may well belong to an earlier period.<sup>42</sup> Relevant also are two stories found in Jewish sources dating from the period A.D. 100-130. The first concerns a man called Ishmael who prevented Jacob, a follower of Jesus ben Pandera, from healing a man who had been bitten by a snake. The second is about a certain Eliezer ben Hyrkanos who admits to his



error in appiauding a specious *halakhah* of Jesus which had been recounted to him by the Christian Jacob of Kephor Sekhanya. These stories show that by the early second century A.D. religious contact between Jews and Jewish Christians had been condemned, which applied also to the reading of Christian literature. A ruling which dates from the period A.D. 90-120 ran: "The book margins and the books of the Minim [i.e. the Jewish Christians] are not saved but they, with the divine names in them, are burned where they are."<sup>43</sup> A further indication of the controversy between the two bodies is to be found in the Rabbinical polemic against the doctrine of the two powers, which had been held in earlier Judaism and is found in the Qumran Scrolls.<sup>44</sup> This attack began in the first quarter of the second century and would certainly have been invoked against the Christian doctrine of the Person of Christ. The above evidence will have shown that in the period A.D. 70-135, and especially from c. A.D. 90, Rabbinical Judaism took active measures against Jewish Christianity which included the expulsion of Christian Jews from the synagogues, the prohibition of religious intercourse between the two groups, and of the reading of Christian literature by Jews. A Jew had to be either a Christian or a Jew; he could not be both at the same time.

The evidence from the Jewish side so far considered is Palestinian in origin, while the Christian evidence comes in the main from Syria and Asia Minor. Can we generalize from this to the position obtaining in the Egyptian diaspora? How far, in fact, were the instructions of the Rabbis of Jamnia, which begin with the promulgation of the *Birkath-ha-Minim*, carried out in Egypt in view of the somewhat freer attitude adopted by Alexandrian Judaism in matters of homiletic and midrashic exposition? Were there any violent contacts between Church and Synagogue during this transition period which saw the slow decline of Hellenistic Judaism from the pinnacle to which Philo had brought it? Again it is the Epistle of Barnabas which throws some light on this difficult question.

Commentators on Barnabas have often been puzzled by the violent reaction which it exhibits against Jewish institutions and beliefs, exceeding anything known elsewhere in early Christian literature, although in itself the Epistle is based closely on a Rabbinical method of exegesis. A good example of this is the polemic against the Temple in 16. 1-2, where the Jews are not only castigated as "wretched men" for putting their hope in the building but are

also stated to have consecrated God in the Temple almost like the heathen. In the same chapter we have an exultation over the destruction of the Temple and the Holy City which is almost unbelievable on the lips of a Jew (16. 5). Similar to this is the writer's polemic against Jewish sacrifices and fasts (2. 4-10; 3. 1-6) and against circumcision, which he regarded as the work of an evil angel (9. 4.). While the political upheavals of the age favoured fanaticism these views appear to have been borne of the consciousness that, as a Christian convert, he was finally excluded from Judaism and its worship never to return. The very fact that he had written a Christian Epistle, only fit for burning as a book of the *Minim*, would have widened the breach; and the same applies to the writer's employment of a Two Ways catechesis, with its doctrine of the two angelic guides, which for the Jews would have savoured of the hated "two powers" doctrine. This Epistle reflects a breach between the two religions which had become absolute, and this is the explanation of its references to "we" and "they" (4. 6; 14. 4), to the "former people" and the "new people" of God (5. 7; 13. 1), and to the covenant which has been taken away from the Jews and given to the Christians (4. 7; 14. 4). The writer sees no continuity between Judaism and Christianity, such as is found in the Epistle to the Hebrews, but only antagonism. The very fact that he could advocate such violent and extreme views, although elsewhere appearing as a kindly and humane man of real pastoral gifts,<sup>45</sup> is an indication of the feeling which existed between Jews and Jewish Christians in Egypt in the early part of the second century A.D. We are thus justified in believing that the Palestinian Rabbis by this time had been able to exert their views in the Egyptian metropolis in the question of religious intercourse and that Jewish Christians had been expelled from the synagogues in accordance with the *Birkath-ha-Minim*. In many ways the situation in Alexandria was then similar to that of the milieu which produced St Matthew's Gospel. This Gospel, like the Epistle of Barnabas, is strikingly Jewish; its structure is based on the five books of the *Torah* and its arguments are essentially Talmudic. Yet this same Gospel reflects also a breach between the two religions which was becoming absolute.

In this article we have sought to use a Christian source for the elucidation of an obscure, although nevertheless crucial, transition

period for Egyptian Judaism. Caution is obviously needed in generalizing from its evidence about the beliefs and actions of Judaism *in toto*; some variety of approach may have continued to exist to a later date, as was certainly the case with second-century Egyptian Christianity. However our results seem to support the view that in Egypt, as in Palestine and elsewhere in the diaspora, Rabbinical Judaism was slowly and successfully enforcing the pattern laid down at Jamnia. During the period A.D. 70-135 the way for the triumph in Egypt of normative, i.e. Pharisaic, Judaism over Hellenistic and sectarian Judaism was being prepared, although the point of no return had not yet been reached—except in the question of social and religious relations between Jews and Christians.

<sup>1</sup> Cowley, *Aramic papyri*, 1923, pap. 13.

<sup>2</sup> Cowley, pap. 44, 3. Five deities can be traced, corresponding to the five gateways to the temple. The colonists may have brought this polytheism with them from Judaea.

<sup>3</sup> B.J. II. xviii. 7; c. *Apion* ii. 4.

<sup>4</sup> For Philo's references to the Jews see *In Flaccum* VI.

<sup>5</sup> L. Fuchs, *Die Juden Aegyptens*, 1924, pp. 43-4; H. I. Bell, *Cults and Creeds in Graeco-Roman Egypt*, 1953, pp. 34-5. The papyri are particularly helpful in illustrating the growth of Jewish communities outside of Alexandria. Cf. U. Wilcken, *Gr. Ostr.* I, pp. 523-4; P. Tebt. III. 817; P. Lond. III. pp. 180f. No. 1177, 57-61.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. also Philo's statement that communities of Jewish Therapeutae were to be found in every nome (*de Vita*. Cont. III). Samaritan communities also existed in Egypt (*Petrie Papyri* II. 92-3)

<sup>7</sup> Philo, *In Flaccum* V-VI.

<sup>8</sup> Agrippa was well known to the Alexandrian money-lenders. J. G. Milne, *A History of Egypt*, 3rd ed. 1924, p. 17.

<sup>9</sup> Hunt and Edgar, *Select Papyri* II, p. 86, ll. 96-100.

<sup>10</sup> H. I. Bell, *Juden und Griechen im römischen Alexandria*, 1924, pp. 27-30.

<sup>11</sup> Bell, op. cit., p. 31.

<sup>12</sup> P. Oxy. IX. 1189 shows that the Oxyrhynchus Jews were especially engaged in this struggle. Eighty years later the inhabitants of the city still celebrated their victory over the Jews at an annual festival, see P. Oxy. 705.

<sup>13</sup> R. Mc. L. Wilson, *The Gnostic Problem*, 1958, pp. 172-255.

<sup>14</sup> The first Jew to mention Philo by name after his time is A. de Rossi (A.D. 1573). The preservation of Philo's works was undoubtedly the achievement of the Christian Church. <sup>15</sup> *De Migr. Abr.* 16. 89f.

<sup>16</sup> *The Origins of the Gospel according to St. Matthew*, 1946, pp. 101-23.

<sup>17</sup> *The School of St Matthew*, 1954, p. 35.

<sup>18</sup> For the dating and provenance of this Epistle see L. W. Barnard, C.Q.R., Vol. CLIX., 1958, pp. 211-29, and *Journal of Egyptian Archeology*, Vol. 44, 1958, pp. 101-7. <sup>19</sup> *St. Clement of Rome*, Vol. II, p. 503.

<sup>20</sup> Kidd. 30a. Rabbi Güdemann, *Zur Erklärung des Barnabasbriefes*, p. 128, holds that this expression would only be possible on the lips of a Jew.

<sup>21</sup> Chullin 60a. This conception was also held by a long tradition of Greek thought from the time of Plato onwards.

<sup>22</sup> Mishna, *Menach* 11; Talmud, *Menach* 100a; Yoma vi. 1-6, 66b; Jos. *Ant.* III. 10. 3.

<sup>23</sup> *Beresh. rabba* 43, 44; Nedar, 32a. <sup>24</sup> *Succa* 21b; *Abod. sar.* 19b.

<sup>25</sup> Mishna, *Rosh. Hash.* iii. 8. In the first two centuries A.D. Amalek, for the Jews, was the eternal enemy. Cf. Justin, *Dial.* xlix.

<sup>26</sup> Cf. *Berachoth* 57b. <sup>27</sup> *According to the Scriptures*, 1952, pp. 107-10.

<sup>28</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 183-202. *Pesher* is also used in the Aramaic part of the Book of Daniel, cf. Dan. 4. 9.

<sup>29</sup> I.Q.S. ix. 17f; Cf. I.Q.S. iii. 2, v. 9, 12; vi. 9, vii. 3-4.

<sup>30</sup> I.Q.S. iv. 18f. I. Qp. Hab. ii. 14.

<sup>31</sup> *Harvard Theological Review*, Vol. XLVI, 1953, p. 135.

<sup>32</sup> Qumran influence on Barnabas was in all probability indirect. Insufficient attention has been paid to the affinities between the Dead Sea texts and the Christian post-Apostolic literature in Qumran studies. The only writer who has discussed this question at any length is J. P. Audet, O.P., "Affinités littéraires et doctrinales du Manuel de Discipline", *Revue biblique*, 1952, pp. 219-38, 1953, pp. 41-82. He has expanded his views in his notable study, *La Didaché: Instructions des Apôtres*, Paris, 1958.

<sup>33</sup> E. R. Goodenough, *Jewish Symbols in the Graeco-Roman Period*, 1953f, has argued that a form of Hellenistic Judaism existed side by side with Rabbinic Judaism in Egypt down to the fourth or fifth centuries A.D. His evidence, however, is mostly drawn from funerary inscriptions, which are notoriously conservative, and cannot be taken as evidence for the continuance of an independent Hellenistic Jewish philosophy. However, his work is a warning against making too rigid a dichotomy between Hellenistic and Rabbinic Judaism. Judaism in Egypt became predominantly Rabbinic although a few Hellenistic elements undoubtedly remained.

<sup>34</sup> W. Bauer, *Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei im ältesten Christentum*, 1934, pp. 49f.

<sup>35</sup> See especially the *Gospel of Truth* in the Jung Codex, which is probably the composition of Valentinus. Text in Ediderunt M. Malinine, H. C. Puech, and G. Quispel. *Studien aus dem C. G. Jung*, Institut VI (Zürich 1956).

<sup>36</sup> A comparison of the structure of the Epistle with that of the Tannaitic catechism might well yield interesting results.

<sup>37</sup> *H.E.* ii. 16. Mr C. H. Robert's demonstration in *J.T.S.* Vol. L., 1949, pp. 155-68 that the Alexandrian Church's custom of writing biblical texts on papyrus leaves, rather than on rolls, was taken over from Roman usage also supports the view that the two Churches were connected. His further view that Eusebius' reference is a reminiscence of the arrival of St Mark's Gospel in the Egyptian metropolis also demands careful consideration.

<sup>38</sup> Athan., *Apol. contra Arian*, xxxv.

<sup>39</sup> Matt. 27. 25; John 5. 17f; 6. 32-5; 7. 19, 37-9 *inter alia*. Rev. 2. 9; 3. 9.

<sup>40</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 109-13.

<sup>41</sup> Matt. 4. 23; 9. 35; 10. 17; 12. 9; 13. 54 (*synagoge* followed by *auton*) and John 9. 22; 12. 42; 16. 2 are relevant here.

<sup>42</sup> *Dial. cum Trypho*, xvii. 1. <sup>43</sup> Kilpatrick, *op. cit.*, pp. 111-12.

<sup>44</sup> I.Q.S. iii. 13-iv. 26. This conception is ultimately Iranian. Cf. *Yasna* xxx. 3, 5. H. Michaud, *Un mythe zervanite dans un des manuscrits Qumran—Vetus Test*, v, 1955, pp. 137-47, believes that Zervanism, a special branch of Zoroastrianism, was the determining influence on the Qumran theology.

<sup>45</sup> I. 1-5, 8; 4. 9; 21. 5-9.



# QUMRAN AND THE CHRISTIAN MINISTRY

BARNABAS LINDARS, S.S.F.

THERE is an unfinished debate about the origins of the ministry of the Church. On the one hand it is claimed that the threefold pattern of bishops, priests, and deacons was instituted by our Lord himself. On the other hand it is known that this cannot be proved earlier than the second century, so that it is difficult to establish a vital connection between it and the work of Jesus, as it is known from New Testament study. The organization of the Qumran Sect, known from the Dead Sea Scrolls, has striking parallels with that of the primitive Church. These parallels apply both to the most rudimentary traces of organization in the Gospel tradition and to the later development. In this paper I hope to show that there is a single leading idea common to the Qumran organization, the work of Jesus, and the beginnings of the ecclesiastical ministry. This is the idea of *anticipation of the eschatological polity*. It will be seen that this alters the terms in which the debate is to be conducted, and may help towards a solution.

## *The Qumran Organization*

The importance of the Dead Sea Scrolls is that they disclose a religious brotherhood which existed shortly before and during the time of Christ, and before the rise of Rabbinic Judaism. It is not necessary to suppose a direct link between it and early Christianity, though this is possible.

The members of this brotherhood, who are held by many scholars to be the Essenes, constituted a fanatically Jewish sect standing apart from official Judaism. Their chief work was the study of the Law. This they performed with meticulous care, though they probably "spiritualized" the temple sacrifices without actually taking part in them. They claimed to be the only true interpreters of the Law. The Levitical priesthood, the "sons of Zadok", who in official Judaism were alone permitted to offer the temple sacrifices, were a special superior class within the brotherhood, and held the chief rank in the organization. There was in fact a hierarchical structure to the whole community, consisting of three ranks, or even four. The *Manual of Discipline* gives these as priests, elders,

and people.<sup>1</sup> The slightly later *Damascus Document* speaks of priests, Levites, people, and proselytes.<sup>2</sup> The Levites seem to be equivalent to the elders. In all the activities—worship, study, chapter meetings, and formal meals—this structure had to be rigidly observed, each person acting in his proper place according to his rank.

The community thus reflects the kind of structure which is characteristic of the theocratic ideal of Israel in later Judaism, e.g. in Ezekiel and the Priestly Code. This is no accident, for the Sect is conscious of itself as the nucleus of the true Israel. The organization is intended to produce a body of people who will be a living temple (the priests being the holy of holies) when God acts at the last day.<sup>3</sup> Then he will overthrow the wicked, but he will dwell in the midst of his living sanctuary, permanently establishing with them his covenant. The organization is obviously intended to be retained in this fulfilment without break of continuity.

For the purposes of administration, each community house of the Sect was to have an inner council, consisting of twelve elders and three priests.<sup>4</sup> It is just possible that the three priests are supposed to be included in the number of the twelve men. Moreover, each house was to have an overseer (*mebaqqer* or *paqid*). In the earlier *Manual* he is apparently a steward with financial responsibility,<sup>5</sup> but in the later *Document* he has greater importance, regulating the admission of novices and administering discipline.<sup>6</sup>

As in Rabbinic Judaism,<sup>6a</sup> a minimum of ten men was required for sacred study, including a priest as leader of the group. The same arrangement was needed to form a proper sodality for the formal meal.<sup>7</sup> The priest first pronounced the blessing on the bread and wine (in that order), and then began eating; and the rest followed in due order. This is described in a fragment which has been styled *The Manual of Discipline for the Future Congregation of Israel*, and takes into account the possible presence of the lay Messiah at such a meal.<sup>8</sup> This implies that the common meal, like the hierarchical structure of the Sect as whole, fits into the category of anticipation of the eschatological polity.

### *The Work of Jesus*

On a critical view of the Gospels it is difficult to believe that our Lord legislated for an institutional Church at all. Verses that might be supposed to have an important bearing on it frequently fall

under the suspicion of being products of the developing life of the Church, read back into the Gospel material.

The basic given fact is that Jesus preached the arrival of the Kingdom of God in his own generation. The idea was familiar to his hearers, but the distinguishing feature of his presentation of it was the uncompromising personal allegiance of the heart which he demanded. This made him put the moral code of love above, and not alongside, the legal code of ritual purity and temple sacrifice. This is a thing which distinguishes his teaching from that of the Pharisees and the Qumran sectaries alike. It also explains why he shows little interest in details of organization. When James and John ask for important positions in the coming Kingdom Jesus turns off the question to pose the challenge of the moral quality required.<sup>9</sup>

Nevertheless, in this very passage, our Lord does not dispute the implied continuity or organization in the coming Kingdom. James and John had hoped for ministerial appointments by virtue of their present position as members of the Twelve. The most primitive elements in the tradition show that this is in fact what Jesus himself intended, as we shall see in a moment.

Such little organization as our Lord does seem to have introduced is dictated simply by the nature of the task which he had undertaken. He was aware that the work of preparing for the Kingdom could not be completed by his own unaided efforts. It was for this reason that he appointed the Twelve, whom he called Apostles, that is, men sent forth, missionaries. Moreover, according to St Luke, he later commissioned "other seventy also", and presumably these also are properly styled Apostles. In this connection we may recall the saying, "Ye shall not have gone over the cities of Israel till the Son of man be come".<sup>10</sup>

There are two points here, the institution of Apostles, and the selection of a council of Twelve. These do not imply the foundation of an institutional Church, because they are essentially the personal representatives of Jesus himself, and their work is expected to complete what Jesus has begun within their own lifetime. The use of the term *apostolos*=*shaliach* places the emphasis on personal representation for a particular assignment, and does not include authority to appoint successors in the same office. The council of Twelve clearly corresponds to the number of the Tribes of Israel, which will be restored and gathered together in the coming Kingdom. Thus the task of the Apostles is limited to an objective

which is expected to be attained within their own generation, but the appointment of the Twelve presupposes the eschatological fulfilment. It is the most indisputable instance of anticipation of the eschatological polity. This is just what James and John had assumed in making their request. The idea is expressly stated in primitive non-Markan strata of Synoptic material: "Ye which have followed me, in the regeneration when the Son of man shall sit on the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel."<sup>11</sup> "And I appoint unto you a kingdom, even as my Father appointed unto me, that ye may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom; and ye shall sit on thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel."<sup>12</sup> It is significant that this latter version belongs to an account of the Last Supper, which is thus an anticipation of the messianic banquet. Everything about it is primitive. Notice the exclusively Jewish perspective, and the concrete idea of the Kingdom, in which Jesus will have his court, and in which the government will share the royal table. The Twelve are promised a political function (judging=governing, as in the Old Testament).

The Church of the Apostolic Age quietly dropped these rudimentary arrangements. The title Apostle disappeared, presumably because it was an office which was intrinsically unrepeatable. Although the number of the Twelve was made up after the death of Judas Iscariot, it played no further part in the subsequent institutional development, merely surviving in symbolical passages. The ministry was necessarily concerned with immediate practical matters, and its vital connection with eschatological functions was lost.

Nevertheless the original picture which is presented is a society formed around our Lord, immediately expecting the End of the Age, and already preparing for it by anticipating the government offices in its present organization. The clearest feature is the use *now* of the future council of Twelve.

### *The Church's Ministry*

The very scanty elements of organization which we have seen to be included in the work of Jesus all have parallels with what is known of the Qumran Community, with the important exception of the institution of Apostles. There is the same anticipation of the future polity, the council of Twelve, and the eschatological meal. The chief difference is the fact that Jesus shows no interest in the



priests and Levites as special classes in the theocracy. On the other hand, it is possible that this hierarchical conception is implicit in the formation of the apostolate, who thus correspond to the Zadokite top rank at Qumran.

This certainly seems to be the case in the earlier phase of development after Pentecost. Acts 6 tells us of the appointment of the Seven, but no indication of their rank or title is given. St Paul in 1 Cor. 12 lists a number of functions of the Spirit, which are not certainly specific "orders" in the Church. But very early the Church adopted the system of a council of elders as a normal method of organization. These manage the affairs of the local church, along with the Apostles, if any are available. We see this in action in Acts 15 (Jerusalem) and 20 (Ephesus). The council of elders (*presbuteroi*=*zeqenim*) would not be significant in itself, for it is a universal method of organization. But in the early Christian literature they form the middle rank in a hierarchical structure, consisting of Apostles, elders, and laity. This is expressed most clearly in Acts 15. 6, 23. It is this structure which is similar to that of the almost contemporary Qumran Brotherhood, as shown in the *Manual of Discipline*, i.e. priests, elders, and people. But the Apostles have taken the place of the hereditary priesthood, whom the Church did not recognize as a special class, any more than Jesus himself did.

We must now show the implications of this parallel. We have observed that the Qumran hierarchy represented the organization of the Brotherhood not only in its work of preparation, but also in the theocracy of the coming Kingdom. We have also noted that our Lord's institution of the Twelve has the same dual reference. The similarity of hierarchical structure when elders are appointed suggests that this also includes the same eschatological perspective. The delay of the consummation and the rapid growth of the Church made some elaboration of organization indispensable; but this was still forward-looking, like the appointment of the Apostles, anticipating the hierarchical structure of the coming Kingdom itself. In other words, when the Church needed more officers, it looked to what Jesus had himself done, to his anticipation of the coming theocracy in choosing the Twelve Councillors, and so simply anticipated further details of its organization. The Kingdom is the New Israel, the fulfilment of the Old, so it is not difficult to know what the future organization is to be like. But the actual model

was the sort of thing already adopted at Qumran, where the same theological motive was at work. These considerations enable us to narrow the gap between the work of Jesus and the development of the ministry. The form of the Church continues the eschatological character of Jesus' own teaching. The real difference between the most primitive period and the later development is not in the introduction of a new ministry, but between the original eschatological perspective and the later tendency to place emphasis on the Church as a more or less permanent institution.

Elders are not the only title shared by the Church with Qumran. It is much more striking that the word for overseer (*mebaqqer* or *paqid*) is the exact equivalent of the Greek *episkopos*, which also means overseer in general, though in our versions of the New Testament usually simply transliterated "bishop". We have seen that in the *Manual of Discipline* the overseer is a steward, who handles the funds of the Brotherhood. But in the slightly later *Damascus Document* he has pastoral care of the members, teaching them and watching over them like a shepherd (the text uses phrases reminiscent of the Good Shepherd theme of John 10).<sup>13</sup> He regulates the admission of novices, and controls affairs with the outside world. The choice and appointment of this person is not described, but it can be confidently assumed that he is drawn from the top rank, i.e. the priests, in view of his responsibilities.

To compare this with the Church, we must look at the use of *episkopos* in the New Testament. Four usages can be distinguished. (i) A synonym of apostleship, Acts 1. 20, where Matthias replaces Judas Iscariot. (ii) All the presbyters of Ephesus are described as *episkopoi* in Acts 20. 28, and the same meaning is probable in Phil. 1. 1. In these two categories the word clearly does not denote a particular office, but is used in its general sense to describe the responsibilities of both Apostles and elders. (iii) A single overseer, i.e. bishop, is mentioned in the comparatively late Pastoral Epistles, 1 Tim. 3. 1-2 and Titus 1. 7. (iv) In 1 Peter 2. 25 Jesus himself is called "the shepherd and bishop of your souls", which reminds us of the use of the shepherd in connection with this office in the *Damascus Document*. These last two categories show the word in its technical sense of a specific functionary, of which Jesus is himself the model. This analysis indicates that *episkopos* is at first non-technical, but becomes the title of the chief officer of the Church

just at the time when the number of Apostles is declining, and the need for leaders is increasing.

It has often been asked why the Church adopted the word *episkopos*, which had no precedent in official Judaism, and the answer has usually been given that it was due to the influence of Greek pagan religious organizations. But now we see that it is more likely to have been derived from such Jewish models as the Qumran Sect.<sup>14</sup> The title Apostle dropped out, because the vital element of personal commissioning by Jesus made this unrepeatable. Moreover there is a change of emphasis. The Apostles were primarily missionaries, but they were also the top rank of the polity. As they die off they need to be replaced, not only for the sake of pastoral oversight, but also to maintain the hierarchical structure. But as the title Apostle could not be used, the Church adopted *episkopos*, which was ready to hand in the kind of models which first guided the Church in developing its organization, and already appears in the Qumran Sect. It will be seen from this that, although *episkopos* is used in a general way in the early days when there are still plenty of Apostles to take the lead,<sup>15</sup> the same word is used in the Qumran manner as a title for the leaders as soon as it is necessary to replace them. This obviously did not happen without the express sanction of the Apostles themselves. Hence the bishops are in a true sense their successors.

The transition from the earlier general usage in connection with both Apostles and elders, to the technical term for the successors of the Apostles and chief liturgical functionaries, probably took place by a natural evolution of Eucharistic practice. We need to recognize that, although our Lord's *institution* of the Eucharist took place in the setting of the Passover, the early Christian *practice* of it was the normal family meal, at least once a week, and at Jerusalem probably every day.<sup>16</sup> The Qumran meal gives a close parallel, because it mentions the blessing of the bread and wine together, and in that order (instead of the wine first). Only a Zadokite priest may perform this blessing. Like the whole hierarchical organization, this meal has an eschatological orientation, looking forward to the joy of the coming Kingdom. The primitive Christian Eucharist likewise had this forward-looking motive. Moreover, the developed organization of the Church shows the bishop performing the blessing of the bread and the wine. It is natural to suppose that in the earlier days it was normally an Apostle who did this, like St Paul in Acts 20. 11.

If there were none present, it would fall to one of the presbyters to preside. The later development is more readily understood if we assume that, when the elders were ordained in any new centre, one was from the first selected to perform this function in the absence of an Apostle, being duly commissioned to do so by the Apostle himself. To him the general term *episkopos* would have a special connotation. His position would be similar to that of the Qumran priest, although he properly belonged to the next rank in the hierarchy. The bishop thus begins by being a special presbyter, but eventually becomes the proper successor of the Apostles. The structure of the Church changes from Apostles, elders, and laity, to bishops, elders, and laity.

There still remains the question of the deacons. Study of the use of *diakonos* and its cognates shows that it is frequently used in the general sense of minister or servant, but has the technical sense only in Phil. 1. 1 and the Pastorals. Without embarking on a lengthy analysis, we can only state our impression that this general sense remains regulative in the New Testament. They are the personal assistants of the Apostles, and later of the bishops, but they do not constitute a specific rank of the hierarchy. They are special functionaries of the laity, and so are also the other people who have charismatic ministries, prophets, healers, and exorcists. These are people whose gifts fit them for particular works in the Body of Christ, but who do not form special ranks in the Church's structure. Later on the deacons are included in the pattern of holy orders, because of their important liturgical functions; and the tendency to elaboration makes for minor orders for some of the others.

### Conclusions

The clue to the origins of the Christian ministry has been found in our Lord's appointment of a council of Twelve, which is precisely the element which the later development tacitly disregarded. This had an eschatological reference, similar to that of the Qumran organization. This was also true of the Apostles as a whole, who were not only missionaries, but also the top rank in the coming theocratic state. It is to have a kind of hierarchical structure, although Jesus has no interest in the claims of the hereditary priesthood of the Jews. The original commissioning of the Apostles and the later pattern of holy orders have a common basis in this anticipation of the theocratic polity.



The first development after Pentecost was the introduction of elders, who are the second rank in the hierarchy. This is simply the logical continuation of the fact that there already exists the order of Apostles. It is possible that one of the elders in each local church, where there was no resident Apostle, was ordained as overseer (*episkopos*), with liturgical responsibility. Because the institution of Apostles is essentially unrepeatable, the designation *episkopos* (already used for elders who perform Apostles' functions) is adopted as an official title. Those who bear it constitute the top rank of the hierarchy and are regarded as the proper successors of the Apostles.

By this time, however, the original eschatological perspective has already been largely forgotten. The moment when this was lost, if a particular moment can be imagined at all, was the time when the Twelve as such ceased to be an essential element in the Church's organization. The idea of the Twelve lived on symbolically in the theology of the New Israel. But neither the Twelve nor the New Israel were thought of in the quasi-political sense of the original eschatology. The vivid realism of the earliest days had already begun to fade.

The threefold ministry of the Church is a development of the primitive institutions, but preserves the fundamental idea of a hierarchy and accords with the concrete notion of the future polity anticipated.<sup>17</sup> But it must be confessed that to-day discussion on the ministry shows little interest in its relation to the promised Kingdom. Whatever be the merits and faults of present-day ecclesiastical institutions, all have sinned and fallen short by failing to retain this vital connection. In the Kingdom of Heaven at the End of the Age there is to be a polity of mutual indwelling in the one Christ, of which the proper temporal expression is the hierarchical structure of the Church.

Return to the New Testament pattern of ministry would involve celebration of the Eucharist with vivid eschatological awareness; the bishop, presbyters, and laity expressing their unity by their proper functions; the deacons, i.e. ministers drawn from the laity, assisting; and the whole act dominated by the joy of the Kingdom of God anticipated and of the present Lordship of Christ.

<sup>1</sup> I.QS. 6. 8. Priests, Levites, and people in I.QS. 2. 19.

<sup>2</sup> C.D. 14. 3.

<sup>3</sup> I.QS. 8. 11.

<sup>4</sup> I.QS. 8. 1.

<sup>5</sup> I.QS. 6. 20.

<sup>6</sup> C.D. 9. 18; 13. 7, 16; 14. 13.

<sup>6a</sup> Mishnah Sanhedrin 1. 3; Megillah 4. 3.

<sup>7</sup> I.QS. 6. 1-8.

<sup>8</sup> I.QS.a, *ad fin.* This is a highly disputed passage, and some wild conclusions have been drawn from the uncertain text, but I do not think my remarks go beyond what all cautious critics would allow.

<sup>9</sup> Mark 10. 35-45.

<sup>10</sup> Matt. 10. 23.

<sup>11</sup> Matt. 19. 28. Only the words common to Luke 22. 30 are original. *Palingenesia* is probably a *theologoumenon* of the Church (only here and Titus 3. 5). "When the Son . . . glory" is typical of Matthew's editing.

<sup>12</sup> Luke 22. 30.

<sup>13</sup> C.D. 13. 9. C. Rabin draws attention to the use of *bqr* in Ezek. 34. 12.

<sup>14</sup> Of course the Qumran Sect may itself have derived the term from Greek models.

<sup>15</sup> The number of Apostles was never confined to the Twelve.

<sup>16</sup> Cf. K. G. Kuhn, "The Lord's Supper and the Communal Meal at Qumran", in K. Stendahl, *The Scrolls and the New Testament* (1958).

<sup>17</sup> Continuity by tactual succession equally accords with the primitive concreteness, but this is a controversial matter which lies outside the scope of this paper.

# THE SERMONS OF J. M. NEALE

A. G. LOUGH

SOMETIMES in second-hand bookshops one may still come across volumes of sermons by J. M. Neale (1818-66). Neale is remembered as a great hymn writer and translator, and also as the founder of the Society of St Margaret, with its mother house at East Grinstead; but as a writer of sermons he is little known to-day. Yet in his sermons the Church has probably received as rich a heritage as she has in his hymns. A discerning writer in the early part of this century compares the sermons of J. H. Newman unfavourably with those of Neale: "It has sometimes occurred to me to question whether the style of Dr. Newman is not greatly over-rated. It is no doubt very noble English, but it seems to me at least to lack that element of magic so often ascribed to it. Be that as it may, when the 'Tracts for the Times' were appearing at Oxford they had no more appreciative reader than a Cambridge undergraduate, who was afterwards to set forth their doctrines in prose. . . ." He goes on to speak of the magical charm of the Sackville College Sermons: "Its great characteristic is the entire absence of effort, any heaping up of words, any seeking after effect, any wearisome attempt at description, any labouring of the point, any working to a climax, any rhetorical devices whatsoever. Quite simply the Christian story possesses the writer of these sermons; he is filled with it. It speaks through him; it tells itself with an unfailing cadence, in words of the utmost simplicity. . . . He begins anywhere, he begins at once. He is at the heart of the matter in a moment. He tells things which have been told a thousand times, which we have heard from our cradles, but he never wearies. . . ." <sup>1</sup> This is high praise, but it is not unwarranted.

Apart from his sermons and stories for children, Neale's sermons may be divided into three groups:

1. The Sackville College Sermons—four volumes.
2. The Sermons preached to the sisters in St Margaret's Oratory—thirteen volumes.
3. Sermons preached on special occasions to various congregations. There is only one volume of this last group, which seems to suggest that Neale was seldom heard outside Sackville College and St Margaret's Oratory. Little did the Church of England of his day realize how much she was missing.

Fortunately for posterity Neale wrote all his sermons out in full. The closely written manuscripts, often very illegible towards the end of his life, are still kept at St Margaret's Convent. Some of these sermons were published after Neale's death by his literary executor, the Reverend J. S. Haskoll, but as he himself died three years after Neale, the Convent itself was left with the task of making the remainder of the sermons available to the public.

Though Neale wrote all his sermons there is evidence from his diary that he sometimes preached *ex tempore*. It would be interesting to know the manner of his delivery. According to his brother-in-law he had not a musical voice.<sup>2</sup> V. S. Stuckey Coles as a schoolboy went to hear Neale preach on a saint's day at St Mary's, Soho: "His text that day was, 'There went a proclamation throughout the host about the going down of the sun, saying, Every man to his city and every man to his own country' (1 Kings 22. 36). Holding up to his eyes a little book in which his sermon was written, he began: 'Oh, my brethren, what a glorious host is that', and presently we were thinking of the saints, their home in heaven, and the hymns which they had written in anticipation of that home."<sup>3</sup>

The four volumes of the Sackville College sermons are based on the Church's year: Vol. I, Advent to Whitsunday; Vol. II, Trinitytide and Saints' Days; Vol. III, Lent and Passiontide; Vol. IV, Minor Festivals of the Church. The final volume, which is probably the best known, contains sermons for every black letter day in the 1662 calendar. Every country parish priest would benefit from reading some of these sermons. One has to realize that they were addressed to the simplest folk imaginable, the aged pensioners of Sackville College. Most of them could not read or write, and few of them had ever been beyond the boundaries of the then remote country town of East Grinstead. Their outlook must have been of the narrowest. Mother Kate in her *Memories of a Sister of St Saviour's Priory* (a book which gives a wonderful insight into Church life in the latter half of the last century) gives a delightful picture of Dr Neale in the environs of Sackville College: "Young, ardent, enthusiastic, large-hearted, full of sympathy, a poet, a scholar, a student, and to crown all, gifted with intense energy of purpose, never, to our judgment, did a man seem more utterly out of place than this young priest, in the midst of these surroundings . . . And this highly wrought, highly gifted young man, seemingly utterly



wasted and thrown away in this bucolic *entourage*, was to kindle a light, which, by God's grace has shone far and wide."<sup>4</sup>

Neale was a born teacher. He had been brought up by his father and mother as a strict evangelical, and he knew the Bible thoroughly. At the early age of five he had been introduced by his father to the typological interpretation of the Scriptures, and this was to mark all his later exposition. He was a brilliant scholar. It was probably shortly before going up to Cambridge that he came to be influenced by the Tractarians, and it was not long before he embraced the full Catholic position. This applied not only to doctrine, but also to ceremonial. He was one of the first to revive the use of the eucharistic vestments. He started at St Margaret's Oratory a daily Eucharist in 1856, perpetual Reservation in 1857, and Benediction in 1859. Yet he never for one moment wavered over the Roman question, and, in spite of episcopal inhibition and bitter persecution, he remained absolutely convinced of the catholicity of the Church of England.

In the Sackville College sermons this brilliant scholar, in simple language and with homely illustrations, introduces his hearers to the fundamental truths of the Catholic Faith. The sermons assume an elementary knowledge of the facts of the Bible. Illustrations are drawn from all sorts of subjects, and there are many topical allusions. The opening of the new railway at East Grinstead in 1855 is made the occasion for a sermon on "The Way to Heaven", from the text Isaiah 40. 4, 5. There is an illustration drawn from telegraphic communication in another sermon. There are allusions to the English weather, which sometimes must have been as trying as it is to-day. He begins a sermon on Advent Sunday:

To another Advent God has spared us: and so in the midst of the shortening days, and cloudy skies, and miserable fogs of November, we have to look forward to His coming whose Kingdom is a Kingdom of light and life and everlasting spring.

The opening words of an Eastertide sermon are:

This dark gloomy weather—this cold nipping wind—they are scarcely fitted, so it seems to me for our Easter joy. We want bright warm days, we want to see the leaves unfolding almost every hour: we want to hear the birds . . . But after all, it is but like what the Apostles themselves must have felt between the time of our Lord's Resurrection and Ascension. Sometimes He showed Himself to them

in His own dear presence, and then all seemed bright and happy : it was like a warm sunny spring day at this time. Then for days together He left them . . . and then everything was like such a dark nipping day as this has been.

One of the most moving sermons must have been that preached on the Feast of St Edmund, a few days after the Funeral of the Duke of Wellington. The text taken is 2 Samuel 3. 38. He begins by painting a vivid picture of the outward pomp and show of that occasion :

Last Thursday, as you all know, the people of England gave such a funeral as has perhaps never been seen before, to their greatest General. You have heard, or read, how for three long miles the streets of London were lined with a crowd that could not be counted; how soldiers, and music, and princes, and chiefs, and mighty men went before the coffin; how the coffin itself, drawn by twelve black horses, rolled on in a brazen carriage, hung with the flags and banners that this great General had won for himself, or that had been given to him by kings as the reward of his bravery : how with the sound of trumpets and drums the procession passed along to S. Paul's; how there, after ashes had been committed to ashes, and dust to dust, a herald proclaimed the titles, the many titles of the Duke of Wellington; and then all was over. Today the coffin lies in the cold, gloomy vault of S. Paul's; there are no guards to watch it there; there are no flags to wave above it now. The worm is spread over it, and the worms cover it. The one question to the great Duke now is, not how many battles he won,—not how many banners he obtained,—but whether he died in grace or out of grace; whether, as we may piously hope, he will find mercy of the Lord in that day.

The Holy Ghost tells us that the 'fashion of this world passeth away.' We can hardly ever have a greater proof of this than that which we have now had. All those crowds that two days ago blocked up the streets of London, are gone; the scaffoldings and the hangings are taken down; the whole pomp has passed away like a tale that is told; another week, and people will begin to be tired of the subject : 'the fashion of this world passeth away.'

A thousand years hence, if the world last so long, who do you suppose will care that, on 18th November 1852 they buried the Duke of Wellington with all the honours and glories of this world? Will any priest then gather his people together, and tell them of the Duke and his doings? Most surely not.

And now see the difference. Nearly a thousand years ago there reigned a king in England, by name Edmund. . . .

and so he goes on to speak of the glory of Edmund and his martyrdom.<sup>5</sup>

Like all great teachers Neale had the gift of explaining difficult matters simply. Even abstruse points of theology are explained in simple language to the pensioners. He explains the meaning of mortal sin :

And what is it to be in mortal sin? If there is one sin which you are in the habit of committing wilfully and intentionally,—if there is one sin, for example that you mean to commit the very next time you are tempted to it, then you are in a state of mortal, or as the Prayer Book calls it, deadly sin. If there be any one sin that you have committed, and for which you have not repented, and would not repent, if you could remember it, then you are in a state of mortal sin.<sup>6</sup>

Neale owed much to the great medieval preachers. One of his books is entitled *Mediaeval Preaching*. This consists of an introduction followed by extracts from the sermons of such well known names as the Venerable Bede, St Peter Damiani, Peter Abelard, St Antony of Padua, and St Bonaventura. One of Neale's favourites was the Portuguese, Antonio Vieira (1608-97). Of him Neale says that whilst he did not live in medieval times, his sermons are thoroughly medieval in character, and he has "as good a claim to be called the last preacher of the Middle Ages, as St Bernard has the title to be called the last of the Fathers".

The sermons preached in St Margaret's Oratory were of a much more specialized type than the Sackville College sermons. They were of course concerned with the religious life. They reveal what a skilled spiritual director Neale was to that young community. What a terrible loss it must have been, when at the comparatively young age of forty-eight he was taken from it, and when the community itself was only eleven years old. The subsequent growth of the Society of St Margaret, and its strength to-day, is surely in no small measure due to the firm foundation laid by its founder. In these sermons something of the depth of Neale's spiritual life is seen. He surely ranks amongst the greatest teachers of prayer. Here we see him pouring out his soul to the little band of nursing and teaching sisters, who are up against so much in the world. It is as if he is opening to them the doors of Heaven, and giving them a glimpse of the glory that shall be revealed. But the only way to the final glory

is through the Cross. Mother Kate writes in her *Memoir*: "Dr. Neale's Bible Classes to the sisters were most marvellous. He walked up and down the little oratory with his Bible in his hand, reading, explaining, asking questions, giving the key to the wonderful mystical interpretation of the Old Testament, with quotations from the mediaeval writers bearing on each subject, so that one saw Christ, and Christ only, in every chapter from Genesis to Revelation."<sup>7</sup>

Though these sermons were written about one hundred years ago, there is still a remarkable freshness about them, as of course there always is in any truly spiritual writing. It is thrilling to listen to Neale expounding the Scriptures and revealing through them something of the unsearchable riches of Christ, and in listening to Neale one knows one is listening to the great teachers of the Church down the ages.

To give some idea of the power and beauty of Neale's sermons we conclude with the opening of a sermon preached at the Dedication Festival at St Matthias', Stoke Newington, in 1859, on the text St Matthew 14. 28, 29. The title is "He said, Come", and is found in the single volume of *Occasional Sermons*:

Can heart of man conceive anything more beautiful than that midnight walk of our Lord over the stormy waves? than the solitude and wildness and desolation of the scene. On the one hand, deep calling to deep because of the noise of the waterpipes, the rushing and raging of the billows, the howling of the wind, the drifting of the dark, angry clouds over the moon: on the other—the holiness and majesty of that Presence, the resting of those feet on the surge, those blessed feet afterwards to be anointed and kissed by that happy penitent, afterwards to be fastened with cruel nails to the bitter Cross; shedding peace, as it were, around them; turning, for the time being, the angry swell into a very haven of peace . . . And see how, in its mystical sense, this journey of our Lord's corresponds with that other time when His disciples were still toiling on the sea, but He had done with it for ever. "When the morning was now come, Jesus stood on the shore". Now it was night, deep dark night, and He was surrounded by the raging waves. Oh how well then, in the night of this world, He knows how to sympathise with His tempest-tossed followers! Oh how well He understands their cry: 'Let not the water-flood drown me, neither let the deep swallow me up!' And oh, how well also He knows what is that glory, what is that peace, what is that Beatific Vision when the storms of this world



shall be passed, and the morning of the Resurrection shall have come, and we also shall stand with Him on the shore of our true and everlasting Country!

<sup>1</sup> R. L. Gales, *Studies in Arcady*. 2nd Series, 1912.

<sup>2</sup> M. S. Lawson, *Letters of J. M. Neale*, p. 13.

<sup>3</sup> *Memoir of V. S. Stuckey Coles*, p. 163.

<sup>4</sup> *Memories of a Sister of S. Saviour's Priory*, 1903, p. 13.

<sup>5</sup> *Sackville College Sermons*, Vol. IV, p. 222.

<sup>6</sup> *Sackville College Sermons*, Vol. I, p. 343.

<sup>7</sup> *Memories of a Sister of S. Saviour's Priory*, p. 23.

# FIVE POETS ON RELIGION

## 1. DRYDEN, POPE, AND YOUNG

ARTHUR POLLARD

WHAT was wrong with religion in the eighteenth century? That something was is widely agreed, even though its reputation has been partially rehabilitated in recent years.. This essay seeks only to examine one aspect of this question, and that rather sketchily. What had the eighteenth century to say about the question of how men believe, of the nature of the religious response? The answer centres upon two words—"reason" and "enthusiasm".

I propose to show what some poets<sup>1</sup> had to say on this matter, not because they may give us a theologically satisfying reply, but because the evidence they provide is that of men more sensitive to the forces impinging upon life than is that of their fellows. As Sir Leslie Stephen put it, "the great poet unconsciously reveals something more than the metaphysician. His poetry does not decay with the philosophy which it took for granted. We do not ask whether his reasoning be sound or false, but whether the vision be sublime or repulsive."<sup>2</sup> In this article, however, I *shall* be asking about the poets' reasoning, but in doing so I shall try to bring their vision to my assistance.

Locke marked the contrast between reason and enthusiasm in the chapter "Of Enthusiasm", which he added to the fourth edition of his *Essay concerning Human Understanding* in 1700: "Reason is natural Revelation, whereby the eternal Father of Light, and Fountain of all Knowledge communicates to Mankind that portion of Truth which he has laid within the reach of their natural Faculties", while Revelation is "natural Reason enlarged by a new set of Discoveries communicated by GOD *immediately*, which Reason vouches the Truth of, by the Testimony and Proofs it gives, that they come from GOD. So that he that takes away Reason, to make way for Revelation, puts out the light of both." Such is the man who surrenders to enthusiasm, which is defined by Locke as "founded neither on Reason, nor Divine Revelation, but rising from the Conceits of a warmed or overweening Brain, [which] strong conceit like a new principle carries all easily with it; when got above common Sense, and freed from all restraint of Reason, and check of Reflection, it is heightened into a Divine Authority, in concurrence with our own Temper and Inclination."<sup>3</sup>

This dislike of enthusiasm was part of the post-Puritan reaction. The private interpretations of sectarians are contemptuously remarked upon by Dryden:

The Spirit gave the *Doctoral Degree*,  
And every member of a *Company*  
Was of his *Trade* and of the *Bible free*.  
Plain *Truths* enough for needfull use they found;  
But men would still be itching to *expound*;  
Each was ambitious of th' obscurest place,  
No measure ta'en from *Knowledge*, all from *GRACE*.  
*Study* and *Pains* were now no more their *Care*;  
*Texts* were explain'd by *Fasting* and by *Prayer*:  
This was the Fruit the *private Spirit* brought;  
Occasion'd by *great Zeal* and *little Thought*.

(*Religio Laici*, 406-16.)

Enthusiasm was anti-intellectual and, partly as a result of this, biassed, magnifying details at the expense of essentials.

But when he wrote this poem, Dryden was mainly concerned to show that reason, and Deism, the religion of reason, were no better:

Dim, as the borrow'd beams of Moon and Stars  
To *lonely, weary, wandering Travellers*,  
Is *Reason* to the *Soul*: And as on high,  
Those rowling Fires *discover* but the *Sky*,  
Not light us *here*; So *Reason's* glimmering ray  
Was lent, not to *assure* our *doubtful way*,  
But *guide* us upward to a *better Day*.

(*Ibid.*, 1-7.)

Both reason and enthusiasm, as Dryden saw them in these passages, represented extreme individualistic, ultra-Protestant positions and had to be rejected. The one rejected revelation, the other prostituted it to its own purposes. Hence the vigour of Dryden's opposition, to be seen, for instance, in the heavy irony (some of it deriving from a sense of social superiority) in the first passage and the aptly critical simile of the second.

Dryden never attained to a condition of responsible Protestantism. At the time of writing *Religio Laici* he accepted the need of revelation and of "divine illumination", but he knew what this latter was not rather than what it was. It was not Deistical reason; it was not private enthusiasm. Like the orthodox Anglicans of his

time, he found right reason helpful but not very illuminating, pointing a way to truth rather than itself showing it forth. But even right reason was often in danger of being put off course. In such an event, he decided,

After hearing what our Church can say,  
If still our Reason runs another way,  
That private Reason 'tis more just to curb,  
Than by disputes the publick Peace disturb.

(*Religio Laici*, 445-8.)

At this date he thought such disputes could arise only from "points obscure". But who was to measure the magnitude of such points? Here Dryden, as elsewhere, appealed to the Church. He wanted an authority outside himself. His was a religion of obedience and acceptance. His entry into the Roman Catholic communion must be regarded as the logical conclusion of his religious progress. There he found the satisfaction for which as an Anglican he had yearned:

Such an *Omniscient* Church we wish indeed;  
'Twere worth *both Testaments*, and cast in the *Creed*.

(*Ibid.*, 282-3.)

For an Anglican Dryden gave the Church too much authority; the eighteenth century generally gave it too little.

Perhaps because he was so dependent, Dryden made little of the doctrines and revelation which the Church conveyed. It was sufficient for him—and the same applies in different contexts in *The Hind and the Panther*—that the Church was taking care of such things. Once or twice, as in the passage on redemption<sup>4</sup> and on the miracle of the Host<sup>5</sup>, there is an appearance of personal engagement, but neither of these approaches that sense of rapture with which he commits himself unreservedly to the guidance of the Roman Church:

Gracious God, how well dost thou provide  
For erring judgments an unerring guide!  
Thy throne is darkness in th' abyss of Light,  
A blaze of glory that forbids the sight.  
O teach me to believe thee thus conceal'd  
And search no further than thyself reveal'd;  
But her alone for my direction take,  
Whom thou hast promis'd never to forsake!

(*The Hind and Panther*, I, 64-71.)



Except in this one respect Dryden's religious experience is lacking in imaginative apprehension. Moreover, he does not even seem to be aware of this deficiency. His search was for intellectual conviction; that is, he was seeking to find a satisfying response other than that of the whole personality. When he failed, he reposed his faith in a creed determined by an authority which demanded, and to which he gave, unquestioning consent.

Pope, who was a Roman Catholic, seems to have been a very liberal one, for he could write to Atterbury, the Bishop of Rochester (20 November 1717):

I verily believe your Lordship and I are both of the same religion, if we were thoroughly understood by each other, and that all honest and reasonable Christians would be so, if they did but talk together every day; and had nothing to do together, but to serve God and live in peace with their neighbours.

This last phrase is never fully developed, but to this and similar statements he repeatedly returned, using one such indeed to allege the Christian orthodoxy of the *Essay on Man*. About the doctrines of this poem he wrote to Caryll on New Year's Day, 1734:

To the best of my judgment the author shows himself a christian at last in the assertion, that all earthly happiness, as well as future felicity, depends upon the doctrine of the gospel,—love of God and man,—and that the whole aim of our being is to attain happiness here and hereafter by the practice of universal charity to men and entire resignation to God.

There is nothing specifically Christian about this, but Pope may well be excused for thinking that there was, for in his day the difference between Christianity and other creeds, notably Deism, was often rather narrow. Indeed, the persistence and acrimony of the Deist controversy may well have been due in some part to just this narrowness of difference. Orthodoxy was too frightened of asserting the supernatural (it always wanted to prove it), and too fearful of claiming an other than rational basis for its convictions. Religion was inevitably this-worldly and ethical. Amid such attitudes of thought and feeling Pope set out to "vindicate the ways of God to man".<sup>6</sup> He begins in Book I with the claim that God can only be known through his works. That is all we know of God, and "What can we reason but from what we know?"<sup>7</sup> God is manifested through the Chain of Being. There is no appeal to any special

revelation; and, if reason seeks to know or infer more than is provided by the order of nature, it falls a prey to passion:

In Pride, in reas'ning Pride our error lies;  
All quit their sphere, and rush into the skies.

(I. 123-4)

If it is not content to abide within its prescribed limits, it becomes private reason, or enthusiasm. Dryden had difficulties with the content of revelation; Pope avoids them by ignoring all special revelation. Instead he is "lowly wise":

Know then thyself; presume not God to scan,  
The proper study of mankind is man.

(II. 1-2)

By this we arrive at Pope's primarily ethical concern. Happiness is our "being's end and aim",<sup>8</sup> but too often man seeks it in the wrong things; "Virtue alone is happiness below".<sup>9</sup> Virtue, for Pope, as the quotations above from his letters show, consists in universal benevolence and possesses divine authority proceeding from a just apprehension of the Chain of Being, the manifestation of God in nature. The man who

But looks thro' Nature, up to Nature's God;  
Pursues that Chain which links th' immense design,  
Joins heav'n and earth, and mortal and divine;  
Sees that no being any bliss can know,  
But touches some above and some below,  
Learns from that union of the rising whole,  
The first, last purpose of the human soul;  
And knows where Faith, Law, Morals all began,  
All end, in LOVE of GOD, and LOVE of MAN.

(IV. 332-340)

this is the man who sees and does the will of God. There is an eloquence here that is more than verbal. The passage moves in an irresistible crescendo to its climax. Here is the kind of vision to which Sir Leslie Stephen was doubtless referring in the passage quoted at the beginning of this article.

But Pope attained his vision, not because, but in spite, of his psychology. He believed that

Two Principles in human nature reign;  
Self-love to urge, and Reason, to restrain.

(II. 53-4)

The passions are “modes of self-love”, initiating the action which reason, “the God within the mind”, directs: or at least that is what happens as long as there is harmony between reason and the passions. But in all men

The ruling passion, be it what it will,  
The ruling passion conquers Reason still.

(originally between II. 148-9)

Reason, now “the weak queen”,<sup>10</sup> must accept this new situation, “And treat this passion more as friend than foe”.<sup>11</sup> In this it is assisted by the fortunate belief that

Th’ Eternal Art, educing good from ill,  
Grafts on this passion our best principle . . .  
See anger, zeal and fortitude supply,  
Ev’n avarice, prudence; sloth, philosophy.

(II. 175-6, 187-8)

Optimistic fantasy seems here to have triumphed over what is often stubborn fact. Pope’s “reason” is right reason, but it is employed, not as by Dryden to seek intellectual conviction, but to ensure moral rectitude. Pope has to confess its inadequacy for the task and to fall back on unwarranted optimism. In his question:

If plagues or earthquakes break not Heav’n’s design,  
Why then a Borgia or a Catiline?

(I. 155-6)

he relies on a false analogy. By comparing man and the inanimate creation he ignores the importance of man’s moral responsibility. There is too little sense of sin in the *Essay on Man*, and, at worst, the doctrine of the ruling passion goes near to implying a deterministic morality.

His system is saved, however, by the energetic sincerity of his moral endeavour. Reason could not help him, nor did he find any hope in external authority, for he minimized the importance of formal creeds:

For Modes of Faith, let graceless zealots fight;  
His can’t be wrong whose life is in the right;  
In Faith and Hope the world will disagree,  
But all Mankind’s concern is Charity.

(III. 305-8)

The sentiment of the second line is ominously anarchistic. The strength of Pope’s religion comes from imagination; it is vividly

intuitive. In its finest expression—humility towards God and love towards man—it carries a fine conviction. It does so in spite of the alleged intellectual, and even the moral, significance of reason. His religious scheme is at once too severely and yet imprecisely intellectual to mean much, one suspects, for himself; and certainly it has meant little for anybody else. Moreover, these attempts at rational proof of God's works and ways have no essential relationship with his moral system. This latter, however, is admirably passionate and disinterested, so much so that it stands forth clearly as Pope's faith. Pope found this faith, but when men are driven to find a faith of their own, it may be one which satisfies them, but it is not often that it satisfies others. Authority and a living tradition count for much in matters of this kind.

After Pope had been accused of Deism in the *Essay on Man*, Edward Young, to whom this poem had at first been attributed,<sup>12</sup> urged him to "write something on the side of Revelation, in order to take off the impressions of those doctrines which the *Essay on Man* was supposed to convey".<sup>13</sup> Pope not being persuaded, Young decided to supply this want himself. He may be referring to this request when he writes in the *Night Thoughts*:

Man too he sung: *immortal* man I sing;  
Oft bursts my song beyond the bounds of life;  
What, now, but immortality can please?  
O had *he* press'd his theme, pursued the track  
Which opens out of darkness into day!  
O had he, mounted on his wing of fire,  
Soar'd where I sink, and sung *immortal* man!

(I. 453-9)

Pope trusted humbly in a "bliss to come", but said no more than this.

By contrast the importance of immortality is at the centre of Young's system. Like Pope, Young believes that happiness is "man's chief good";<sup>14</sup> but, unlike Pope, he believes that it is unattainable in this life. Writing under the shock of multiple bereavement, he did not find earth testifying universally to a beneficent Creator; instead he saw

Rocks, deserts, frozen seas and burning sands;  
Wild haunts of monsters, prisons, stings and death.  
Such is Earth's melancholy map! but far  
More sad! this Earth is a true map of *man*.



So bounded are its haughty lord's *delights*  
To woe's wide empire; where *troubles* toss,  
Loud *sorrows* howl, envenom'd passions bite,  
Ravenous *calamities* our vitals seize  
And threatening *fate* wide opens to devour.

(I. 287-95)

Man must therefore, so Young's argument runs, find recompense elsewhere:

His grief is but his grandeur in disguise,  
And discontent is *immortality*.

(VII. 53-4)

There must be recompense—that is essential to Young's thesis—either, as here, for sufferings endured, or as in other instances, for virtue unrewarded upon earth:

Since *virtue's* recompense is doubtful, *here*,  
If man dies wholly, well may we demand,  
Why is man suffer'd to be good in vain?

(VII. 177-9)

He believes that

Man's unprecious natural estate,  
Improveable at will, in virtue's lies;  
Its tenure sure; its income is divine.

(VI. 480-2)

The self-interest inherent in this estimate of virtue is to be found again in Young's statement of the relationship between reason and free-will:

A nature *rational* implies the power  
Of being blest, or wretched, as we please.

(VII. 1296-7)

We also see here welcome evidence of a man who recognized that the various faculties must co-operate in any really satisfying religious response.

Virtue is "true self interest pursued",<sup>15</sup> but it is so, not because of the end-product, but because of the force which virtue derives from its origin:

Is *virtue*, then, and *piety* the same?  
No, piety is more; 'tis virtue's source;  
Mother of every worth . . .  
With *piety* begins all good on Earth

'Tis the first born of rationality . . .

On piety, humanity is built,

And on humanity, much happiness:

And yet still more on piety itself,

A soul in commerce with her God is Heaven.

(VIII. 690-2, 697-8, 706-9)

Virtue, as the offspring of piety, is practised to the glory of God, that is, it is not only moral, but also religious. Indeed, Young believes that virtue must be religious or must cease to be, for

Conscience, her first law broken, wounded lies;

Enfeebled, lifeless, impotent to good.

(VIII. 699-700)

With Pope, love of man led to love of God; now in Young it is the reverse process, and, so far as religion is concerned, the right way round.

Young has achieved this reversal, because he has accepted the paradox in God, who is still seen as the remote, inscrutable Deity of Pope:

The nameless *He* whose nod is Nature's birth . . .

The great *First-Last*! pavilion'd high he sits

In darkness from excessive splendour borne.

(IV. 409, 412-3)

But he is also the personal God, abiding with men and knowing Naught greater, than an honest, humble heart;  
An humble heart, *his* residence.

(VIII. 476-7)

The paradox in God brings out the paradox of man, at once the basest and the most exalted of creation, made so by the work of redemption:

Should man more *execrate*, or *boast* the guilt

Which arous'd such vengeance? which such love  
infram'd?

(IV. 211-2)

By redemption, "death in Heaven",<sup>16</sup> man has become

A glorious partner with the Deity

In that high attribute, immortal life.

If a God bleeds, he bleeds not for a worm:

I gaze, and, as I gaze, my mounting soul

Catches strange fire, Eternity! at thee.

(IV. 496-500)

such strange fire indeed that for a moment Young achieves impassioned statement. His moral system pulsates with life that proceeds from the adoring contemplation of the crucified Christ:

Talk they of morals? O thou bleeding Love!  
Thou maker of *new* morals to mankind!  
The grand morality is love of thee.

(IV. 781-3)

The address to Christ is the mark of a new intimacy in the religious experience. Adoration now becomes possible:

On such a theme, 'tis impious to be calm;  
Passion is reason, transport temper, *here*.

(IV. 639-40)

He adores, because he is a new man with a new vision. Everything is different, as compared with the unenlightened condition of other people and erstwhile of himself:

*He* sees with other eyes than theirs; where they  
Behold a *sun*, he spies a *Deity*.  
What makes them only smile, makes him adore.

(VIII. 1106-8)

Blake could see in the sun that vivid "innumerable company of the Heavenly host crying, 'Holy, holy, holy is the Lord God Almighty' ",<sup>17</sup> but, as Young was writing in 1754, we must perhaps be thankful for even this somewhat prosaic statement of his reactions. He surprised himself at times. At one point he cries:

Enthusiastic, this? Then all are weak  
But rank enthusiasts. To this godlike height  
*Some* souls have soar'd; or martyrs ne'er had bled,  
And all *may* do, what has by *man* been done.

(VI. 593-6)

But, lest this should mislead, let me say at once that Young's religion, for the most part, was not the stuff of which martyrs are made. There were moments of passionate praise, but, on the whole, Young's faith rested on the old rationality:

*Reason* pursued is *faith*; and unpursued  
Where proof invites; 'tis reason, then, no more.

(IV. 743-4)

*Reason* the root, fair *faith* is but the flower;  
The fading flower shall die; but reason lives  
Immortal as her Father in the skies.

(IV. 751-3)

*Night Thoughts*, as an exposition of his creed, shows the emphasis which Young placed upon reason. The successive sections of the poem become each longer than the last, spread over with vast tracts of ratiocinative blank verse ("10,000 lines of inexpressible tedium", Professor Humphreys has called the poem), too rarely relieved by passages of praise; and even in these Young is too often rhetorical. It may be that, in the semi-lyrical passages which are marred by this rhetoric, we can see the new enthusiasm struggling to birth. Young is a transitional figure. He still relies on the old standards of rational faith and virtuous life, but added to these are an intimate sense of God, a welcome other-worldly awareness, a new importance attached to redemption, and a recognition of the duty of worship, which together herald the next phase of eighteenth-century religion.

<sup>1</sup> I begin this survey with Dryden, who, though not of the eighteenth-century chronologically, occupies an interesting position in relation to the question of authority in religious belief. He is within the period as a segment of religious history, for "eighteenth-century religion" may be said to begin at, or soon after, the Restoration, and to run as far as the beginnings of the Oxford Movement.

<sup>2</sup> *English Literature and Society*, Readers' Library ed., 1927, p. 12.

<sup>3</sup> *Essay*, Book IV, c. XIX, paras. 4, 7.

<sup>4</sup> *Religio Laici*, 101-6.

<sup>5</sup> *The Hind and the Panther*, I, 81-105.

<sup>6</sup> *Essay on Man*, I. 16.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, I. 18.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, IV. 1.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, IV. 310.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, II. 150.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, II. 164.

<sup>12</sup> Joseph Warton: *Essay on the Genius and Writings of Pope*, 1772, II. 121.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, 204 n.

<sup>14</sup> VIII. 1027.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, VII. 143.

<sup>16</sup> IV. 460.

<sup>17</sup> *Vision of the Last Judgment*, 95.



# PUBLIC RELATIONS FOR THE CHURCH

GLYN MORLEY DAVIES

THE Church is sometimes alleged to be sadly unambitious when it comes to maintaining a live relationship with world progress and opinion. So, one feels that Church authorities, generally, would not immediately be attracted to a suggestion that an organized scheme of public relations could provide a new service and stimulus to the teaching of Christianity and the dissemination of knowledge of Christian affairs and beliefs.

It would probably reward the Church in this country to give serious consideration to some of the potential advantages to the cause of carefully conceived public relations, which is now accepted as a powerful aid in interpreting and publicizing the objectives and activities of so many public bodies and organizations.

Public relations is a relatively new science that is proving eminently successful in projecting all manner of social enterprises and in forging many new links of "communication".

But, you will say, public relations is a secular business. True, at present it is mainly associated with secular projects, but it can just as successfully help the Church to maintain an active relationship with the people; and it is as well to remember that the Church relies considerably on secular aids such as bazaars, jumble sales, whist drives, exhibitions, and concerts to help it along.

One would think that each Christian denomination in Britain would stand to gain much by adopting a tasteful and discreet public relations programme based on accepted Christian ethics and codes of practice. Applying public relations to Church affairs would, incidentally, create no precedent: in a modest way, it is being done attractively and effectively by some religious denominations already. The Roman Catholic Church has discovered the many advantages that are to be gained from a wisely planned and well directed public relations policy. One has only to be reminded of the success of the Catholic Enquiry Centre, which is now widely advertised, to appreciate what is being done quite opportunely.

Then, there is the care that is taken by the Roman Catholic Church to publicize the principal events in its calendar and to ensure that at any public function involving that Church it is properly and adequately represented. The Church also welcomes enquiries from Press representatives who seek news and information

on current topics and events. The Roman Catholic Church takes these matters seriously and plans and promotes its public relations decisively and deliberately. Witness the world-wide publicity obtained for the Pope's Easter Message, which confirms this opinion. Their enlightened policy and excellent organization are bringing their due reward.

Other denominations, probably unaware of any really conscious effort within the recognized framework of public relations practice, have made spasmodic attempts to help the man in the street to keep in touch with Church affairs and to appreciate the Christian faith and way of life as it is practised in many different forms. Much of this public relations effort has been unco-ordinated and conceived only locally, independently, and without integration. These attempts have nearly always lacked direction and, consequently, much of their efficacy has been dissipated and rendered fruitless. Many Church authorities have sensed that something should be done, but much effort has been needlessly wasted through lack of experience, incorrect procedure, and bad timing, so that, despite the good intentions, little of value has matured and many promising concepts have remained uninterpreted and so have achieved nothing.

If Church leaders would study the advantages and opportunities that would accrue from a prepared public relations policy for the Church, based on expert guidance, many of them would regain a forceful psychological spiritual contact with the people around, and outside, the Church who are waiting to be informed and helped. The Church has always demonstrated a sympathy towards those with a presumed lack of faith, but has not always been successful in bridging the gap. Knowledge breeds confidence in the same way that ignorance breeds fear and suspicion. Religion can hope to flourish only where there is a spirit of true understanding: adequate information is surely the key, whilst public relations provides the lock which can grant access to public thought and opinion. When information is dispensed wisely and with sincerity it will arouse support from many who might not otherwise have cared. The Roman Catholic Church, once again, is alive to the several possibilities. When religious films are planned in the United States and in other countries, and when sound radio and television programmes based on a religious theme are contemplated, the Roman Catholic authorities appreciate the importance of offering their

services to producers and others in an endeavour to ensure that all religious references and ritual based on Roman Catholicism are introduced appropriately and accurately. This practical recognition of the potentialities of the new science of public relations is repaying the Roman Catholic Church, and enlisting new support for it.

The Church of England has a public relations organization which has done useful work, but it does not seem to have developed and expanded as well as one would have hoped. Certain difficulties may have been encountered, which may have hindered greater progress so that the desired momentum has yet to be attained.

Is not organized public relations for the Church worth a serious trial? Would it not repay every Church organization to have a public relations committee to formulate and co-ordinate publicity for the Church? Its functions would be to improve the many ways and means available to inform the public on its day-to-day activities. The Church, at large, is charged with the vital responsibility of spreading the message of the gospel in the form of its own beliefs. Reputed and trusted public relations media are there to help fulfil this mission: the spoken word, the written word, and the visual aid are all waiting to be harnessed to the universal preaching and performance of the Christian faith.

Many will not hesitate to criticize the observations and suggestions that have been submitted: others will say, blithely, that it is all being done already by the Churches in many different ways. It is being done, but rather in many "indifferent" ways, indiscriminately and ineffectively, simply because there is no proper planned approach to the matter and no basic co-ordination. Of course, we shall be reminded of Church magazines, religious films, posters, books, and pamphlets that have been produced and published. All these are valuable media provided they are used to the best advantage and are designed and distributed effectively. The "Wayside Pulpit" and similar poster series have achieved a good public contact by their simple, clear texts, but this has hardly been forceful enough. The film is one of the most excellent public relations media, and some very good religious public relations films have been produced and given practical support by various Church authorities. In contemplating the use of religious films one quickly realizes that film has helped to preach the Christian message in many ways that have proved distinctly successful. And why does not the Church make more use of judicious advertizing? "What,

advertizing the Church? What a shocking idea!" the purists and critics will exclaim. But again it is not new. The Church has been producing handbills and posters for years, but has had to do so on such a small scale, and so cheaply, that it has had little chance to prove effective and make a real public impact. The problem here, one has to concede, is cost: poster, and similar printing is expensive to-day and any one church acting independently cannot afford this expense. One would advance a plea for more centralized printing by the denominations: well-designed stock posters could be prepared for such regular events as bazaars, jumble sales, concerts, and oratorios, and such annual festivals as Easter, Harvest and Christmas. Overprinting done locally, on posters for example, could be performed at an economic rate.

Reference to printing brings one, inevitably, to consider the general use of print by the Churches. We shall be reminded promptly, that thousands of church bodies have published their monthly magazines for years. Yes, of course, nearly every church "runs" its parish or church magazine: they are almost an accepted feature of the British way of life. But how often are they recognized by their unattractive and dreary contents which follow such a monotonous pattern, month by month. And how badly are so many of them edited and printed. There are some of us who can recall attendance at Conferences where the values and merits of what are called "house" magazines and the use of print have been discussed at expert level. Good and bad examples of print have been displayed and discussed. And how thoroughly embarrassed one has felt when the pages of some unfortunate parish or church magazine have been flashed on the lecturer's screen to emphasize how badly—and how very carelessly—print can be used. The retort to this observation will undoubtedly be that the Church must consider its costs and is forced to keep its magazine production expenses down to rock bottom. This would seem to be a sound argument as one realizes the Church cannot afford the cost of high-grade art paper, colour, high-class printing, and expensive art layouts. But one would suggest that it could still make far better use of the facilities and craftsmanship that it *does* pay for. Is the difference between good and bad cooking, merely the cost of the ingredients? Is not there something to be said for the way the ingredients are used? There is no excuse for careless proof reading and the use of dull headings and an unimaginative presentation. Well-spaced paragraphs, and apt titles



and sub-headings, cost no more than their alternatives. And let us remember the printer is not often to blame. He carries out the editor's instructions faithfully and implicitly. He is the craftsman whilst the editor always remains the architect.

A church public relations committee could supervise, amongst other things, the publication of the church magazine. Few churches are without some member who could act as honorary editor, so that the parson could be spared the additional burden of editorial work, which is so often superfluous to his day-to-day pastoral duties and responsibilities.

I suppose there are few people now who are not aware that the great success of the Billy Graham mission in London was fundamentally due to the dignified use of public relations techniques with good organization to back them up. There were other factors, of course, but the fact that the visit of Dr Graham created such a popular appeal was mainly due to the excellent organization and publicity that made the meetings known throughout the country. These adequately supplemented Dr Graham's personal qualities.

In proffering these thoughts for the consideration of church authorities and leaders one would prophecy that, sooner or later, public relations will be much more widely and regularly used by the churches to publicize their activities. Real benefits will accrue to the first Christian denomination bold enough to launch a full-scale public relations programme to make known over a wide field its spiritual beliefs and functions. The results would be worthy of the careful preparation that would have to preface such a policy and programme. Such a project would serve to bring Christianity nearer to the people than ever before. Radio and television have already done much to advocate the values of a practical religion; radio is a public relations medium that is more widely used in other countries for religious teaching than in this country: the United States is, as one would imagine, first in the field in this respect. So far, in Britain, there has been no central plan; but the possibilities are tremendous. How long can the churches afford to do without organized public relations?



# CORRESPONDENCE

## THEOLOGY AND SCIENCE

SIR,—It is not possible to comment in detail in a short letter on the interesting article by Mr Macdonald Smith in the January issue of the *Church Quarterly Review*, but there are a number of points which I, as a scientist who tries to be an Anglican, would like to make.

Mr Smith remarks on the small proportion of scientists and the even smaller proportion of technicians who are Christians and on the problem of religious communication with members of these two groups. With the technicians I am not here concerned—they will probably follow wherever their scientific masters lead them with a time lag of a generation or two, and, in the meantime, the problem of commending the Faith to them is similar to that of commending it to other persons of similar social and educational background. They present but a particular aspect of a situation which has faced the Church since the industrial revolution. Among the scientists the case is rather different. A most surprising and interesting phenomenon is that a large proportion of scientists show great sympathy and understanding of many of the problems which confront modern Christendom. The problem is to present, not merely the pastoral and artistic achievements and aspects of the work of the Church but also its theological foundations, in a form which is intelligible and acceptable to these intelligent and sophisticated men of goodwill. The difficulty is to persuade technically but non-theologically educated people that theological terms have meaning, and that rational religious discourse is possible.

The first point at which I would take issue with Mr Smith is where he claims that a philosophy of science exists and that “it exists to determine in the broadest manner what questions are the proper province of science and what are not”. Alas, we are not told where this philosophy of science is to be found, or who invented it. Most scientists would probably say that we do not know the limits of scientific inquiry, or even whether such limits exist. We would say that all questions which have meaning are legitimate and fall within the “proper province of science”—in fact, we might say that the proper province of science is to answer questions which have meaning. At the same time we would assert that science is at only a very early and crude stage of development, so that there are many questions the meaning of which cannot be expressed in the current language of science, and to which, therefore, modern science can give no sensible answer. This is not to say that no other form of activity can answer them either, but merely that, at least for the present, science cannot. We can discover the limits of science (as of any other method of inquiry) with certainty only by reaching them, and it would be silly to pretend that we have yet done so.

Mr Smith assures us that “the valid and assured results of scientific research can never contradict God’s revelation of himself as mediated by the Church. Where there is a seeming discrepancy, this will be

resolved by a patient examination of the evidence on the part of scientists . . .". Now really, does this mean that if the Church supports Ptolemy then Copernicus must be wrong? With all respect to the Holy Spirit and the Fathers of the Church, can we be sure that the revealed truth as mediated by the Church is always true? Is there no possibility of an error in transmission? If there is no such possibility it is rather hard to account for differences of opinion among theological scholars, the divided state of Christendom, and the history of the last two thousand years. I am afraid that Mr Smith rather misunderstands the attitude likely to be found among scientists towards the relationships of reason and revelation. The problem, as the scientists see it, is not so much to induce reason to comply with revelation, as to persuade the interpretation of revelation to accord with reason and observation. Now this does not imply that the scientists think that they are always right, or that they are unwilling to investigate the accuracy of their observational and analytical techniques when shown cause why they should be suspected of error; but it does imply that they would welcome a similarly humbly critical outlook in other quarters. Mr Smith is, I fear, less than fair to most of his theological brethren, who are willing to think again if their first thoughts lead to unreasonable conclusions.

Mr Smith proceeds to try to show that certain properties of the universe—order, reality, contingency, createdness, dependency, and intelligibility—follow from the arguments for the existence of knowledge and for the existence of God, and that these properties are necessary for the prosecution of science. Without trying to pronounce on their validity, it is certainly true that the arguments for the existence of God are not compelling, for if they were everyone open to conviction would by now accept them. Further, as presented by Mr Smith there seems to be a suspicion of a circular argument, in which "the world is ordered" is used as a premiss in the demonstration that "God exists", and then the existence of God is used to show that the world is ordered. I have never been convinced that the arguments for the existence of God, even if valid, show that God is Christian. It is much harder to assert that Jesus Christ is God than to assert that God exists. Thus, there seem to be a number of essential steps missing from Mr Smith's argument. He must demonstrate *convincingly* that the Christian God exists, without calling on any data concerning the universe; then he must show that the properties of the universe follow logically from this demonstration; and finally he must prove that no other chain of reasoning leads to the conclusion that the character of the universe is such that it may be investigated by scientific techniques, if he wishes to persuade scientists that "it is only by means of a Christian Philosophy of Science that it is possible to show that these properties actually exist in the cosmos" and that their existence is necessary to scientific endeavour.

It is common ground that the properties of order and intelligibility are essential for the pursuit of science; scientists might claim that the mere fact that they find order and intelligibility in the universe is

sufficient foundation for their belief that they are there—that the success of science as shown by its accumulated self-consistent data is itself justification for the assumption that there are more data to be found.

I do not wish to suggest that it is in principle impossible to convince scientists of the essential truth of the Christian Religion, but it does seem to me unlikely that a coercive intellectual demonstration of that truth can at present be produced. The approach to the scientists should surely be by appeal to moral and human values, together with an attempt to show empirically that there appears to be no fundamental inconsistency between the doctrines of theology and natural science, the objective being to instil faith in God rather than mere acceptance of a philosophical system. It is sensible to recognize that the problems of producing a philosophical synthesis of all truth are enormous, and, indeed, probably not susceptible of solution from the fragmentary knowledge at our disposal. I believe that such a synthesis will ultimately be achieved, but do not expect that it will include an ontological proof of the existence of the Christian God. I hesitate, however, to claim rational grounds for this belief—it belongs, for the time being, to faith (or possibly revelation) rather than to reason.

Finally, Mr Smith and I agree that “all truth is one and comes from God”, and that there is more than one way in which it is possible to seek truth. Whether we proceed from revelation and interpretation or from observation and reason it is our duty to endeavour to free truth from the contamination of mere human opinion which conceals and distorts it. It is not given to any man, be he theologian or physicist, to be infallible, but it is a worthy enterprise for him to seek the truth as far as he is able.

I have tried to show, without detailed analysis of his arguments, why it seems to me unlikely that Mr Smith’s approach will commend itself to scientists, and at the same time to indicate where the difficulties appear to lie. I have great regard for his purpose, but I am afraid that the outlook and language of his article are so foreign to scientists that they are unlikely to give him a sympathetic hearing.

Natural Philosophy Department,  
The University,  
Glasgow.

P. SWINBANK

### MATINS AND ANTE-COMMUNION

SIR,—There is certainly need for a unified Morning Service: in country parishes, where often there is only one service each Sunday, an urgent need. Mr Thurmer has struck out on a new line by basing the synaxis of such a service on Matins rather than on Holy Communion. If I am not misinterpreting him, his order of service would run thus:

Collect of the day or Kyries; Psalm; O.T. Lesson; Benedictus; N.T. Lesson (from the Gospels); Nicene Creed; Intercession; then the Communion Service from “Ye that do truly . . .”

I suggest that the structure of Matins might be followed in two further respects: first, by placing the penitential section at the beginning of the service, as has already been done in various revisions (*Principles of Prayer Book Revision*, p. 39); secondly, by placing the sermon *after* the intercession. After the Offertory, the service would then proceed straight to *Sursum corda*, as in the Scottish rite. This arrangement brings the ministry of the word and of the sacrament into closer contact; and the order of events would be familiar to Matins congregations, who are likely to welcome a unified service less warmly than regular communicants.

It is not suggested that the actual forms of the Matins penitential section should necessarily be retained, or those of the Communion Service substituted. The Lambeth Report (2. 81) desiderated shorter exhortations and corporate expressions of penitence. Those of Compline are now widely familiar, not only in their context, but also in such rites as the Mothers' Union Office!

The new position of Benedictus between Old and New Testaments is a marked improvement, while the disappearance of *Venite* will do more than anything else to remove the atmosphere of monotony and formality which hangs over Sunday Matins. Many, on the other hand, will miss *Te Deum*, and this could be made alternative to *Gloria in excelsis*, which it resembles in origin, form, and purpose.

But to follow this or that order is less important than to provide *some* form on these lines. Clearly it could not be duly authorized until the Canons have received the Royal Assent; but that day seems to become ever more remote. Can we not employ the intervening time in trying out two or three experimental forms, so that when the day does come, a definitive revision, based on the experience thus gathered, may be ready for immediate adoption?

The Vicarage,  
Billesdon,  
Leicester.

G. J. CUMING

# REVIEWS

## THE SCRIPTURE TRANSLATED

THE NEW TESTAMENT IN MODERN ENGLISH. By J. B. PHILLIPS. Bles. 45s. (Half Leather, 84s.)

THE translations of the books of the New Testament which Mr J. B. Phillips has issued during the past twelve years are now too well known throughout the English-speaking world to need any introduction. He has given to the post-war generation a fresh understanding of the Christian Gospel by making the New Testament "come alive", and the whole Church is deeply indebted to him. We welcome therefore this new publication in which the whole of the New Testament as translated by Mr Phillips is available in one volume.

Mr Phillips has written a new Foreword to this edition which, though short, is important. He sets out what he considers to be "three necessary tests which any work of transference from one language to another must pass before it can be classed as a good translation". It must not sound like a translation, the translator must obtrude his own personality as little as possible, and there should be produced in the hearts and minds of the readers an effect equivalent to that produced by the original author upon his readers.

With these three ideals as principles for guidance he considers the justification of his own methods, and he explains why, in some passages, he was driven into what appears to be a paraphrase, simply because a literal translation of the original Greek would prove unintelligible. He was on his guard not to lose his sense of proportion and read back into simple utterances meanings which would surprise, for instance, St Paul, and he insists, rightly, that we must "take these living New Testament documents in their context". Judged by his own principles Mr Phillips has indeed, in the opinion of many, achieved a very high degree of success.

The Lambeth Conference 1958 in Resolution 11 welcomed the new translations of the Scriptures, and in Resolution 12 "invited the Churches of the Anglican Communion to engage in a special effort during the next ten years to extend the scope and deepen the quality of personal and corporate study of the Bible". This new edition of the New Testament in Modern English will be of great help in this essential study, and the more so because Mr Phillips' translation makes the New Testament more intelligible to those whose mental training has been largely in modern habits of thought and who find the language of the Authorized and Revised Versions a barrier to understanding the essential message of the Scriptures. If it is true, as Committee One of the Lambeth Conference wrote in its report, that "it is through the Bible that the modern world can come to understand itself", all Christians must make every effort to understand and interpret the urgent message which the Bible has for the world in which we live. Mr Phillips' translation will help



them to do this and the publication of the translations in one volume is therefore most timely.

A special word of praise is due for the printing and binding of this edition, which are both excellent.

✠ R. PETRIBURG :

## THE BAPTIST AND HIS BACKGROUND

SAINT JOHN THE BAPTIST AND THE DESERT TRADITION. By JEAN STEINMANN. Longmans. 6s.

TO READ this book is sheer delight, and to review it a privilege. "Before the Qumran discoveries, (John) seemed to be in splendid isolation, the only vehement prophet of an age which seemed to know only political agitators, scheming collaborators, casuists trusting to hypocrisy or spiritual men writing apocalyptic books in the silence of their cells. Today, John the Baptist re-emerges as a representative of the age." Thus the author (page 174). Here is an essay, in limpid English (the translator has done supremely well), on the background of the Baptist and the Gospel-proclamation, and it must be said that one very seldom meets a work of this size ranging so freely and so competently over the author's field. Everything is here: the secular historians, the family ramifications of the Herods, the Messianic hope of Israel, the discoveries in the Judæan desert, the fear and the attraction of the waste land in Hebrew tradition, the eschatological nature of the Gospel-message. The author wears his evident erudition and wide learning lightly, but there is nothing in this magnificent little book which is in any way superficial.

One notes that Steinmann opts for Dr Dodd's suggestion that the "lamb" of John 1. 29 is Messianic and not sacrificial; that Hebrews was in all probability the work of Apollos of Alexandria—here the author is at one with Spicq in pointing to the curiously "solitary" nature of the epistle as against the rest of the New Testament. There is a very enlightened and cautious estimate of the character of "fringe-Judaism", and an examination of the possible fate of Judaistic Christianity after A.D. 70. "Baptist" movements owing something to John—however remotely—are briefly examined, and there is a very useful discussion of John in iconography and art. There is a very fine chapter on the place of asceticism in the Christian life, and the attitude of the eschatological community to the world.

Lavishly and intelligently illustrated (how many of us have seen a photograph of a Mandaean baptism?), this work is a triumph of no mean order for the publishers. It incidentally confirms your reviewer's suspicions—that serious theological literature can be produced far more cheaply than is so often the case. This little book ought to be in the hands of every intelligent layman, and on the shelves of every student beginning theological study.

C. S. MANN, O.S.B.

## PHILIPPIANS IN MODERN DRESS

THEY MET AT PHILIPPI. By CARROLL E. SIMCOX. A. and C. Black. 9s. 6d.

IT HAS been said that the Epistle to the Ephesians resembles a bishop's Pastoral Letter, while Philippians is more like "The Vicar's Letter" in a parish magazine. Dr Simcox's commentary may be said to reduce St Paul to the stature of a genial and "folksy" clergyman of the Protestant Episcopal Church.

The book abounds in clichés—"to think out and think through", "to get Christian theology started, and along the right lines" (both p. 12); "God's priorities" (p. 40); "measure up to" (pp. 31 and 63); "ready to take it" (p. 62). The section about Euodias and Syntyche has the chapter-heading "When Saints Can't Click"! And when we find 4. 13 translated "In him who strengthens me I can meet anything" the sense of bathos is almost painful.

Quotations from obscure secular writers are almost as frequent as scriptural references. (Surely the stanza beginning "We share our mutual woes" on p. 98 must qualify for inclusion in the *Anthology of Bad Verse*!) Occasional unfamiliarities of idiom—"a necessary implicate" (p. 60); "abhorring separation" (p. 76, the first word is presumably a participle and not a gerund)—and orthography ("offense", "center", "favour") are no less calculated to irritate the English reader.

In places one is inclined to question Dr Simcox's scholarship. Were there really "other imperial palaces than that of Rome" (p. 19) in the first century A.D.? And does not he completely miss the point of Alcibiades' simile in the *Symposium* when he says (p. 90):

The gaiety of Socrates, his charm and courtesy, were the outward and visible means by which earnest seekers of truth were drawn to the wisdom he preached?

But these are minor blemishes, and must not be allowed to blind us to the merits of the work as a whole. The exposition of the epistle is sound, if pedestrian. Dr Simcox steers a wholly orthodox course between the Scylla of *sola fide* justification and the Charybdis of Pharisaic legalism. He rejects outright the doctrine of indefectible grace:

Christians who claim to have 'the assurance of final salvation' as a result of having been 'saved' are claiming more for themselves than Paul dared to claim for himself (p. 110).

And his exposition of the life in Christ as understood by the apostle leaves nothing to be desired.

Critical problems receive scant attention. He neatly by-passes the problem of "bishops and deacons" in 1. 1. He rejects the extreme kenotic interpretation of 2. 5-11 but takes no account of the exegesis which renders *ekenosen* as "poured out" rather than "evacuated". And he slips into inaccurate theology when he says (p. 74): "in all of the Son's afflictions the Father is afflicted." On the other hand his treatment of the

crux in 1. 15 ("some indeed preach Christ even of envy and strife") is lucid and convincing.

In short, there is little of profit for the critical scholar in this book, but plenty for the devout layman.

ROBIN ANSTEY

## EVOLUTION AND THEOLOGY

DARWIN: BEFORE AND AFTER. By ROBERT E. D. CLARK. The Paternoster Press. 10s. 6d.

SCIENTIFIC theories are, by their nature, essentially temporary formulations, sufficing only as long as they withstand the chilly eye of scrutiny and accord with experimental results. Very frequently, modification and qualification of the original theoretical statement is necessitated by new evidence while extrapolations may be made, not always legitimately, into regions quite unsuspected by the propounder. Such is the case with the Darwinian theory of evolution; and the centenary of the publication of *The Origin of Species* which is now being celebrated, provides a suitable point at which to survey the status of theory and to distinguish between legitimate modifications and the accretions of opinion and prejudice. But the theory is unique in the extent of its ramifications, biological, sociological, and religious, and presents a demanding and complex situation to any author. Dr Clark, however, bends himself to his task and from the outset writes with vigour and obvious sincerity. In the opening chapters, the author seeks to show that the concept of evolution (i.e. non-fixity of species) was known for several centuries before 1859, holding that "it is doubtful if Darwin had anything new to say about it, save for the mass of evidence with which he supported his claims". It escapes mention, regrettably, that this represents the very strength of Darwin's case and distinguishes it from the earlier philosophical notions of evolution.

In an analysis of Darwin's personality and motivations, Dr Clark paints a gloomy picture of a wanton and neurotic man, a psychologically sick mind, who takes to science as an escapism to suppress his religious needs. This, Dr Clark diagnoses, is the root of the trouble and the battle is joined between evolution (or more particularly, natural selection) and Christianity. Darwin, the author asserts, lays the way open for the worst in man to emerge; scientists, even in the present day, are still under the influence of evolutionists, taking to their subject "out of a desire to escape from theology". Here, as elsewhere in the book, Dr Clark appears to be a victim of his own enthusiasm and voices generalizations which are misleading, to say the least.

It is stoutly maintained on scientific grounds that the creative aspects of evolution remain unsubstantiated. Scientifically, however, the treatment tends to be superficial and gives little consideration to important modern work on biochemical evolution and genetics. The section on entropy could well have been omitted.

Whatever may be Dr Clark's message on Darwin (readers are left to suspect that it is special creation and good old-fashioned theology), the essential notion of God, as revealed in his creation, remains and whether one accepts evolution or not, the evidence for a pattern in creation is well demonstrated. It is not more difficult for the Christian to believe in a world constructed of atoms and molecules through which life and spirit reveal themselves than in the gospels being channels of Divine revelation, though printed with an alphabet of twenty-six letters. Finally, it should be said that Dr Clark's book offers cold comfort to Fundamentalists for whom no treatment of the Scriptural interpretations of creation is undertaken. Dr Clark's book is likely to provoke renewed interest not only in the evolutionary theory but also in the public attitude toward scientific claims.

P. W. KENT

### LEWIS'S PSALTER

REFLECTIONS ON THE PSALMS. By C. S. LEWIS. Bles. 12s. 6d.

ONCE again we have been given a real treat by Mr C. S. Lewis. Also, not only a treat to enjoy throughout but solid intellectual and ethical guidance. Though he modestly disclaims being an expert and states that he writes as "unlearned" we find that he has given us "strong meat for grown men".

These Reflections are clearly the fruit of years of faithful meditation. With a deep devotion to God and a fearless honesty tenaciously pursuing truth and accuracy, the author deals one after the other with "objections" to the Psalter. In each case he leads the reader from an atmosphere of unanswerable difficulty through clear explanations to see the invaluable lesson waiting to be discovered and to share his own enthusiasm for it. The "Cursing Psalms", the apparent self-righteousness in the Psalter, and why should God *want* to be praised?—these and other problems are tackled completely and successfully. Our call to praise God leads to the telling remark that "Praise almost seems to be inner health made audible".

He states: "The most valuable thing the Psalms do for me is to express that same delight in God which made David dance." This book certainly makes that same thorough-going delight available for all who will but read it. "Against mere dutiful Church-going and laborious 'saying our prayers' this joy in God stands out,—astonishingly robust, virile and spontaneous; something we may regard with an innocent envy, and may hope to be infected by as we read." The age-long bug-bear for wilful human beings, obeying the Will, the Laws, of God he transforms into its true valuation with an unforgettable illustration. The Psalmists' "delight in the Law" springs from "seeing it is not arbitrary terror but because in the Law they have touched firmness like the pedestrian's delight in feeling the hard road beneath his feet after a false short cut has long entangled him in muddy fields".

Together with guidance on big matters, like his chapter on "Con-nivance", he gives us equally stimulating crisp sentences such as: "Reading the Bible as mere literature and not attending to the main thing that it is about seems to me to be nonsense." One plea of his should set us all furiously to think: "I seldom meet any strong or exultant sense of the continued, never-to-be-abandoned, Humanity of Christ in glory, in Eternity. We stress the humanity too exclusively at Christmas, and the Deity too exclusively after the Resurrection. . . . the ancient interpretation of Psalm 8, however arrived at, is a cheering corrective." Cheering correctives he gives us in abundance, some in explanations of obscure phrases: "The pains of hell gat hold upon me" he gives us as "I was at death's door".

It is a book that all the laity might do well to possess. Certainly every parish priest should get it on to his own shelves and those of the local public library, and in his own parish library, and keep it in busy circulation.

T. L. MANSON, S.S.J.E.

### BULTMANN'S MYTH

THE CHRISTIAN MESSAGE AND MYTH. By L. MALEVEZ, S.J. S.C.M. 25s.

THIS useful and charitable book labours under the disadvantage that much of it is a translation of a translation. In his endeavour to be scrupulously fair to Professor Bultmann, Père Malevez has given extensive extracts from Bultmann's writings, which are, it is generally agreed, often extremely obscure. How far Gallic lucidity has triumphed over Teutonic obscurity is somewhat doubtful; but one cannot help suspecting that Miss Olive Wyon, experienced translator though she is, has sometimes found it difficult to dispel the darkness. Most of the criticisms which the author directs against Bultmann's position have already appeared in *Kerygma and Myth*, and the chief merit of his book is its clear demonstration of the extent to which Bultmann is indebted to Heidegger's "anthropology of existence", which, in Père Malevez' words, "was instrumental in Bultmann's achieving a more elaborate and considered expression of the purely actionalist and demythologized Christianity which he had already accepted". One cannot help feeling that the irruption of existential philosophy into Christian theology has been unfortunate in its results, though it has chiefly affected continental Protestant theology, and Anglican theologians have on the whole reacted sharply against it. The general Catholic attitude is well represented by the present able, sane, and charitable criticism by Père Malevez. In the most important section of his book, the chapter entitled "The Saving Event", the author has pointed out that Bultmann's position with regard to the atoning work of Christ is capable of two interpretations, an objective and a subjective interpretation, and he has



shown reason for believing that Bultmann's own view was really objective, admitting the existence of non-phenomenal divine interventions in history.

S. H. HOOKE

## CISTERCIAN THEOLOGY

THE CISTERCIAN HERITAGE. By LOUIS BOUYER. Mowbray. 22s. 6d.

STUDENTS of Church History are aware that the influence of the Carolingian renaissance of the ninth century extended to the eleventh. For example, Berengar of Tours was a disciple of John the Scot and of Ratramn of Corbie. It is true that most theologians of the eleventh century would have none of this tradition. The name of John the Scot was erased *passim* from the only MS. of Berengar's *De Cœna Domini* which has survived, and Paschasius Radbert was followed rather than Ratramn. It is therefore surprising that the Carolingian tradition was continued by the Cistercian theologians of the twelfth century—and this book shows there were such—and no one objected. William of St Thierry digested the *De Divisione Naturae* of Erigena, and Isaac of Stella was influenced by the Pseudo-Dionysius whose work influenced Erigena. Moreover, these Cistercian writers, even St Bernard, revived an older tradition, that of Origen, for long condemned by the Western Church. Gregory of Nyssa was studied by William of St Thierry, and this study of Eastern theology by the Cistercians was accompanied by criticism of some of the ideas of St Augustine—another new tendency in the West. Indeed, it is possible that had the Cistercian "heritage" been developed, the Reformation might have been avoided.

However, Professor Bouyer is not concerned with such historical problems. He gives an account of Cistercian theology and piety in the writings of St Bernard, William of St Thierry, and Aelred of Rievaulx, supplemented by those of Isaac of Stella (another Englishman) and Guerric of Igny. Without desiring to break away from the discipline of coenobitic life, they went back to the sources of monastic piety, not only to St Benedict but especially to the Bible. Perhaps there have been no more lovely emanations of Evangelical piety than those produced by these Cistercian writers. Students will note an acute but sympathetic psychological study of St Bernard.

A. J. MACDONALD

## THE GOAL

HEAVEN IN THE CHRISTIAN TRADITION. By ULRICH SIMON. Rockliff. 42s.

MR SIMON'S latest book should take him in reputation very near the front rank of Biblical scholars. He shows a range of interest and an ingenuity of interpretation not usually observable in English writers. He has, too, an independence of position which is well adapted to times like

the present, when the schools of criticism are being re-formed. If he has a fault it is that he crowds his canvas so heavily with detail that the point of emphasis is sometimes lost.

The present book, after a rather slow start, in which Pagan and Hebrew views are considered, has an excellent chapter on the God of heaven. Subsequent chapters deal with the society of heaven, the enemy of heaven, the victory of heaven, life in heaven, and heaven in Christian worship. In all this there is plenty of scope for what is perhaps the best feature of the work, namely the rehabilitation of apocalyptic. Here at last we have someone who can enter into the spirit of this fantastic type of literature and really make it mean something. This success is achieved not merely on the archaeological but the spiritual level. If the explanation is addressed more to our emotions than to our powers of ratiocination, it is none the worse for that. The same is true of the apocalypses themselves.

The book abounds in good things. "The glorification of Jesus is the central fact of the Christian proclamation." "The Bible views Heaven and Earth as one world. If the earth is spatial, so is Heaven. If the earth is inhabited, so is Heaven." "To worship through Jesus Christ is to translate the union with God, or 'eternal life', into liturgical terms."

It would be difficult to enumerate all the many fields of inquiry opened up in these few chapters, but to read them attentively is a liberal education.

The jacket contains a moving account of the way in which the book came to be written. But has not the name Buchmann somehow replaced that of Bultmann?

W.W.

## THE CHURCH UNIVERSAL

THE KINGDOM OF CHRIST. By FREDERICK DENISON MAURICE. Edited by ALEC R. VIDLER. S.C.M. 2 vols., 15s. each.

*The Kingdom of Christ*, first published in 1838 when the author, then chaplain to Guy's Hospital, was in his early thirties, was written ostensibly for the enlightenment of Quakers "respecting the principles, constitution and ordinances of the Catholic Church". Maurice, however, had written also and perhaps primarily for Churchmen.

Why is there such an interest in F. D. Maurice to-day? In part it is because he came to his convictions by the hard way, feeling intensely the problems of his day, political, social, and religious. "No man", he wrote, "will ever be of much use to his generation, who does not apply himself mainly to the questions which are occupying those who belong to it." These were no idle words. Maurice was a leading Christian Socialist and a founder and first principal of the Working Men's College. He was involved in bitter controversy and was attacked in the *Record* and *Church Quarterly Review*. He was dismissed from his professorship

at King's College, London, on account of his strong and progressive views. In part also it is because his theological writings are characterized by a human sympathy, a breadth of outlook, and an intellectual power and honesty which set him apart and ahead of most of his contemporaries and which commended him neither to the more conservative nor the more liberal Churchmen.

Why is *The Kingdom of Christ* of especial interest, more than a century after its publication? The answer is given by Dr A. R. Vidler in his excellent introduction: "The writing of 'The Kingdom of Christ' . . . led him (Maurice) to articulate profound and seminal thoughts about the Being of God and the status of mankind in the universe, about the nature of the Catholic Church and its most familiar institutions, about both civil and ecclesiastical polity and the relations of Church and State. . . . He was in fact writing a book that is outstanding among works of English divinity not only in the nineteenth century but in any century. Not least in the twentieth century, when 'the principles, ordinances, and constitution of the Catholic Church' are being reconsidered on an ecumenical scale as they never have been before, does 'The Kingdom of Christ' deserve to be both widely and closely studied."

In Part I Maurice considers the principles underlying the greater Protestant systems and the philosophical and political movements in Protestant countries; in Part 2 "the Catholic Church and the Romanish System"; in Part 3 "the English Church and the systems which divide it". Of the latter, the Liberal, Evangelical, and Catholic, he says, "Our consciences, I believe, have told us from time to time that there is something in each of them which we ought not to reject. . . . We may find that there is a divine harmony, of which the living principle in each of these systems forms one note, of which the systems themselves are a disturbance and violation. This seemed to be the case in our previous inquiries respecting Protestant bodies and the Catholic Church . . . ." Before him Maurice had "the idea of a Church Universal, not built upon human inventions or human faith, but upon the very nature of God himself, and upon the union which he has formed with his creatures: a Church revealed to man as a fixed and eternal reality by means which infinite wisdom had itself devised".

C. T. CHAPMAN

## CHURCH HISTORY

THE SPREADING FLAME. By F. F. BRUCE. Paternoster Press. 21s.

WITH the title of *The Spreading Flame*, the Paternoster Press has recently published under one cover what were originally three separate books dealing with different periods of Church History, by the Professor of Biblical History and Literature in the University of Sheffield. The result is a large volume, covering the era from the preaching of John the Baptist to the conversion of the English—and even including the eighth century Anglo-Saxon Missions to the continent of Europe.

As one would expect in a work of this character, it has been necessary—to use Dr Bruce's own words—"to select certain features and pass over others". This becomes most obvious in the third and final section, "Light in the West", where the writer is dealing with the progress of Christianity from the accession of the Emperor Constantine the Great. Even so, I was interested to notice that on pages 356-7 he has found room for a description of that curiosity of early Christianity, known as the "magic square", a subject which I have not previously seen so fully treated in any general volume on Church History, although a few years ago it managed to find its way into that trial of would-be deacons, the General Ordination Examination!

If the author's own standpoint is "Evangelical", his work does not, on that account, show want of fairness in judgement; whilst a glance at the multitude of names and references which appear both in footnotes and in the text itself, will be sufficient evidence of the reading and scholarship that have gone into its making.

Not the least factor to commend it is its price. Four hundred and thirty pages extending over something like eight hundred years of ecclesiastical growth and advance, for the sum of one guinea, seems in these days. remarkably good value.

GORDON HUELIN

## EARLY DIVISIONS

ST STEPHEN AND THE HELLENISTS IN THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH. By MARCEL SIMON. Longmans. 15s.

PROFESSOR SIMON of Strasbourg is an acknowledged authority on the subject of Judaistic Christianity and his discussion in the present book of the position of St Stephen and of the party of the Hellenists to which he belonged is of considerable importance.

He believes that the Hellenists under their leaders, the Seven, represent a group of Reform Jews possibly originally independent of and parallel to the main body of the Jerusalemite Church which looked to the Twelve. With his typical charity the author of Acts represents a more far-reaching cleavage as a dispute over rations. He rejects the suggestion of H. J. Cadbury that the Hellenists of the Acts were originally not Jews at all but converts to the Church drawn from the Gentile world, but is equally dissatisfied with the view that the distinction between Hebraist and Hellenist covers nothing more than a difference of language. On the analogy of the suggestion of the late T. W. Manson that Pharisee really means Persianizer, he holds that the term Hellenist could be used to describe those Jews who followed or who were believed by their opponents to follow Greek or Gentile ways of thought or styles of living. It may therefore be little more than a term of theological abuse and need not be overpressed.

Partly on grounds of language he believes the speech of St Stephen to be a pre-Lucan compilation and probably in substance authentic. It forms



part of a wider literature presenting theology under the form of a historical narrative. While this has its roots in the Old Testament, there are other examples in the Acts. Yet both in content and scale of treatment there are marked contrasts between the speech of St Stephen and the comparable sermons of St Peter and St Paul. The fact that the major events which it selects from the history of Israel all took place outside Palestine points strongly to Dispersion Judaism as the pre-Christian matrix of the martyr's thought. More than half the speech is devoted to a discussion of Moses, a fact which leads Professor Simon to describe it as Moseocentric rather than Christocentric. The attitude of St Stephen to the Law seems highly individual. There is no trace of the Pauline doctrine of the Law as the schoolmaster to bring us to Christ. The Law itself is good and God-given; it was the Jewish cultus which put them on a false trail. The possibility of Samaritan affinities to the thought of St Stephen is suggested to Professor Simon by these (and similar) traits in the Speech and may even find some support in the successful mission conducted there by the Hellenists after the martyrdom of St Stephen.

Professor Simon devotes considerable attention to the Christology of the Speech. The unusual title "a prophet like unto Moses" recalls a Samaritan speciality of the so-called Mosaic Messiah as well as certain remarkable expressions in the so-called Clementine literature. "The Righteous One" is an archaism found elsewhere in Acts. The suggestion of a close connection between the Christologies of St Stephen and of the Epistle to the Hebrews made by William Manson is strongly criticized and an alternative line of descent is traced to the Clementine literature through some of the Jewish sects mentioned by Justin Martyr and Epiphanius.

It is impossible in a brief review to do justice to the many important questions raised by this book. Is the treatment of the term Hellenist really satisfactory? Is the centrality of Moses in the Speech really as overwhelming as the author evidently thinks? In the light of the Mosaic undertones in the New Testament can we be confident of a Samaritan colouring of the expression "a prophet like unto Moses"? Is the Christology of the Speech as "low" as Professor Simon thinks and might not the relation with the Epistle to the Hebrews, if perhaps not so close as William Manson thought, be stronger than the present work suggests? I find it hard to be as confident of the reliability of the data supplied by Justin Martyr and Epiphanius as Professor Simon appears to be. The evidence for Judaistic Christianity is notoriously scanty and problematic.

The book raises important questions and collects a mass of material for the further study of its subject. It is closely reasoned and splendidly documented. The author is careful not to make excessive claims for his conclusions. Even so in the present state of the evidence it would perhaps be wise not to be overconfident of the solutions which are here proposed and to use the book rather as a springboard for further study than as a summary of assured results.

H. E. W. TURNER



## CHURCH BUILDING OVERSEAS

ANGLICAN CATHEDRALS OUTSIDE THE BRITISH ISLES. By BASIL F. L. CLARKE. S.P.C.K. 45s.

"WELL, really, I had no idea . . ." This was the first comment of most people to whom I have shown my copy of this enterprising piece of book-making by Mr B. F. L. Clarke. It justifies what Mr Betjeman says in his foreword that the book is both a shock and an encouragement to Anglicans. A shock, because most of us had little idea that the cathedrals of overseas dioceses were worth taking seriously; an encouragement to think that our branch of the Catholic Church cuts so substantial and dignified a figure in the countries of the world. Ignorant people, like myself, have supposed that an Anglican Cathedral in foreign parts would best be built in a version of the native style; but this comprehensive survey soon disillusion us. Both circumstance and common sense forbid such a solution; circumstance because most of the older cathedrals have been built in the first instance for Anglican settlers or residents, who thought a church ought to look like the churches they knew at home; common sense because, though some native styles are capable of catering for the needs of Anglican worship, it must be done at a later stage and by the people themselves.

The book is well produced, with a large number of good illustrations from photographs, and competent indexes. The short accounts of each cathedral vary considerably in interest; some are very informative and are helped out by photographs, others really tell the reader nothing at all. For example All Saints' Cathedral, Bendigo, which succeeded a building destroyed by a cyclone, was rebuilt at a cost of £4,200 in 1857; a new Cathedral is projected, and the choir has been completed. Beyond the fact that its pulpit, by Sir Gilbert Scott, came from Westminster Abbey, we are told no more about it, and we have no idea what it looks like or even what it is made of.

The cathedrals of the older colonies and settlements started life as the church of the English community, and were elevated to cathedral rank when a bishopric was founded. Several such churches are shown in the illustrations, and bear witness to the wonderful adaptability of the classical style which looks perfectly at home in Spanish Town, Jamaica, in Capetown, or in Quebec. A specially attractive cathedral of this kind is that of St John's Providence, Rhode Island, where the late classical façade of 1810 has Gothic windows, and the nave is roofed with a shallow dome. And I like the sound of St John's Calcutta, a Georgian church with an altar piece by Zoffany and hung with crystal chandeliers.

The mid-nineteenth century cathedrals overseas were mostly built for diocesan status. Mr Clarke tells us that many of them were much influenced by the ecclesiological movement in England, and, from the illustrations, almost any of them might be a fashionable church transplanted from the West End of London. But the great Gothic churches such as St Paul's Cathedral, Melbourne, by Butterfield; St John's, Bris-

bane by Pearson; St Peter and St Paul, Washington; and of course, St John the Divine, New York (of mixed style but very magnificent), must be amongst the finest churches in the world.

Among the more modern cathedrals overseas is a small group of Moorish design; Mombasa, Dodoma, Seoul, and Phoenix, Arizona. These all look to have acclimatized themselves very well in tropical surroundings, and this may be the architectural form that cathedral building in eastern countries will take in years to come. Three cathedrals look to me, from the illustrations, to be specially romantic. One is Fredricton, New Brunswick, built to the design of Frank Wills to resemble Snettisham in Norfolk. He was a great ecclesiologist and caught something of the mounting fire of Gothic art. Another is Grace Cathedral, San Francisco, by Lewis Hobart, who adapted Bodley's plan. The tower has a carillon of forty-three bells. The third is Aklavik, the timber-built Cathedral of the Arctic in a restrained Gothic style. It has an altar frontal of white Moose skin, adorned with patterns in porcupine quill embroidery by Red Indian women.

The book is a striking witness to the growth of the Anglican Communion, most of which has taken place during the last hundred years.

SEIRIOL EVANS

## HISTORICAL ANNUAL

NOTTINGHAM MEDIAEVAL STUDIES. Vol. I. Printed for the University of Nottingham by W. Heffer & Sons Ltd, Cambridge. 15s.

*Nottingham Mediaeval Studies* is, according to the editorial in this its first number, "to appear once every year at the beginning of September". It is to be of about a hundred pages of print, and to contain contributions by members of the academic staff of the University which gives it its name.

Those responsible for its coming into being may have had very good reasons for deciding against the inclusion of the normal "snippets" to which we are accustomed in journals of this kind, as well as of book reviews "long or short". However, to restrict its reading-matter to four or five lengthy articles, all of them of an exceedingly specialized nature, must surely have the disadvantageous effect of limiting both its appeal and its circulation.

As to the 1957 volume which here falls under review, I will merely note in passing the contributions by Mr R. I. Page on "Drauma-Jons Saga", and by Dr K. C. King "On Motives and Literary Sources in German Heroic Literature", and confine my remarks to the two remaining articles which will be of interest to the Church historian.

The first of these—which, incidentally, makes the reader at once aware of the latitude to be allowed in this new publication to the word "medieval"—is entitled "Christianity and the Northern Barbarians". How, and to what extent was Christianity diffused among the barbarian peoples at the time when the Fathers of the second

ecumenical Council held at Constantinople in 381, decided that the churches of God among those peoples must be governed according to the established custom?—is one of the major questions which Professor E. A. Thompson endeavours to answer in his contribution. He suggests a number of channels by means of which Christianity was carried to these people: (a) barbarian warriors returning home after serving in the Imperial armies where they had accepted the Faith; (b) sons of the Church taken prisoner by the heathen and converting their captors; (c) Christian missionaries travelling in company with merchants. Yet, for all that these might and did achieve, such efforts were haphazard and unorganized: indeed, "the Churches of the fourth and fifth centuries delayed for a curiously long time to send bishops to their captive sons and daughters beyond the frontier; and they made little or no organized or planned effort to save the barbarians from the fire everlasting". It remains that several of the great Germanic peoples were converted to Arianism before the disappearance of the Western Empire in 476; and the concluding section of this article is devoted to a consideration of the conversion of each of these in turn—the Marcomanni, Vandals, Sueves, and Burgundians; and, with less information at hand, the Ostrogoths, Gepids, and Regi.

Professor Thompson's scholarly and fully-documented study may well supply a useful additional chapter to the more general volume on early Church History where, except for Ulfilas and his efforts at converting the Goths, this fascinating subject has, more often than not for want of space, to be treated somewhat summarily.

The second article to which attention may be drawn is Mr M. W. Barley's "Cistercian Land Clearances in Nottinghamshire". Here the writer is at pains to show how the foundation of Rufford Abbey, roughly midway between Mansfield and Newark-on-Trent, in the central years of the twelfth century, provides a clear instance of the Cistercian policy of destroying existing villages in order to achieve their ideal monastic seclusion. The Rufford establishment did, in fact, involve the disappearance of three villages, and the growth of a new settlement at Wellow, as well as the alteration of parish boundaries and of the line of the main road. Mr Barley's article attempts to work out these changes in detail. Sketch maps, one of the village of Wellow with its unusual triangular green—possibly, says the writer, a medieval market-place—the other of the surrounding neighbourhood, help to illumine the text. A careful study, mainly for those concerned with local topography, or with the history and development of English monasticism.

To publish a new journal of the character of *Nottingham Mediaeval Studies* is, in these days, a bold venture. We can but wish it the measure of success it deserves.

GORDON HUELIN

## MORMON UTOPIA

HOMEWARD TO ZION, The Mormon Migration from Scandinavia. By WILLIAM MULDER. Minnesota University Press. 6os.

TO ANY reader with a hearsay knowledge of Mormonism, this book will come as a surprise. The reviewer was not aware of many aspects of the Mormon heresy and had no idea of the sociological forces behind this movement. To the outsider, Mormonism is chiefly known for its polygamy, a fact which has distorted and obscured some important aspects of this sect. This well-authenticated and dispassionate study reveals a story of great human interest, adding yet another chapter to the annals of human endeavour.

The book is more than a document of American history; though essentially a sociological work, it touches upon Church history and theology as well.

For those who are interested in biblical eschatology, the story of the Latter-Day Saints provides a living example of the dangers of theological aberration. The danger of eschatological extravagances to Protestant circles is the greater because not tempered by the restraining influence of historic tradition. Behind the fantastic story of Joseph Smith's discovery is the all-too-human desire to hasten the End and bring about the Consummation. The reviewer was constantly reminded of Ibsen's *Brand* and Gerhart Hauptmann's *The Fool in Christ*, where a similar atmosphere prevails; only in the case of the Mormons we leave behind the world of fiction and find ourselves in the realm of history.

Dr Mulder's book gives a graphic and matter-of-fact account of Scandinavian peasants and small-holders, cobblers, and tailors, who set out on the way to Zion to take possession of the Promised Land. It is a moving story of human courage, faith, and endurance.

The reader inevitably asks himself the question: what was it that stirred the imagination of these simple folk to move them from their native soil at the price of sacrifice, suffering, and privation? Was it all for the sake of an ideal?

The answer is Yes. But to the Danish peasant Zion was more than an ideal, it was a reality, a fact in history. He knew where it was and it was for him a matter of conscience to make every effort to get there.

The migration of the Scandinavian Saints was the result of an awakening initiated by sustained missionary propaganda. It is part of the Mormon message that Joseph Smith inaugurated the New Era; that the People of God must be gathered in; that America is the Promised Land; that English is the holy Tongue. These hitherto insignificant men and women suddenly found themselves participants of a great drama—the consummation of God's purpose upon earth. Such faith gave them zest and fortitude. They believed themselves to be following the call of God to establish his Kingdom.

That the Kingdom of God is beyond man's reach we can only learn from personal experience. Mormons are not the only ones to make the



mistake. The failure of Mormonism is an object-lesson to all Christian activists.

As in the case of British Israelites and Jehovah's Witnesses, the Mormons are under strong Old Testament influence. Their whole social and ecclesiastical structure is patterned after the model of Old Testament Israel. The ideal of the perfect theocracy is the moving force behind the Mormon spectacle. Mulder quotes from the Minute Book of the High Priests' Quorum at Mt Pleasant: "The Government of God as a theocracy was superior to democracy or any of the other Institutions of man." It was the privilege of the Latter-Day Saints to rediscover the perfect government and to submit to its rule. Such an attempt required a new start upon virgin soil and America provided all the conditions. That Mormonism has failed, as the Church has failed, as man is bound to fail, is part of the strange anomaly in human history.

Dr Mulder has kept clear of theological issues and treats Mormonism as a sociological phenomenon. He has amassed a wealth of material, but in spite of its weight the book is lightly written, even with a touch of humour. The English reader may falter at some Americanisms but this in no way detracts from the fascination of the work.

JAKOB JOCZ

## THE LITTLE FLOWER

AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF A SAINT (Thérèse of Lisieux). A new translation by RONALD A. KNOX. Harvill. 21s.

St Thérèse of the Child Jesus died in September 1897, at the age of twenty-four. In 1925, (when, had she lived, she would only have been fifty-two) she was canonized. *The Story of a Soul*, her simple autobiography, was published in 1898. A venturesome provincial printer produced 2,000 copies, but three at least of the Carmelite Convents disapproved of it. But by 1911 the Convent was receiving fifty letters a day; by 1914 five hundred. By 1918 47,000 copies of the book had been sold—to-day the sales can be counted by millions.

The MS. falls into three parts. The first, and much the longest, is addressed to her sister Pauline, who was then Prioress, under the title of Mother Agnes of Jesus. Here Thérèse describes in child-like detail the little intimacies of a Christian home, her own peccadilloes, her passionate devotion to her father, deepened by her mother's death; her first Communion, followed by her Confirmation, and the dawning sense of her Call, crowned by an obstinate determination to enter the Carmel at the earliest possible date.

Gently rebuked by the two of her sisters who had already entered Religion, she attempted to get her favourite uncle's patronage. He told her that it would be the height of imprudence of the Authorities to admit her. She applied to the Father Superior in charge of the spiritualities of the Convent. He told her that the canonical age was twenty-one (she was fifteen)—and that she could begin by practising



the Carmelite Rule at home. Nothing daunted, she succeeded in getting an interview with the Bishop of Bayeux. His Lordship was sympathetic, but felt that he could not give approval to such a step. He had heard of Thérèse's wild assertion that she would appeal in person to the Holy Father, and he smilingly agreed to that.

M. Martin, her father, was quite prepared to see his little daughter's ambition fulfilled, and to Rome they went. Thérèse broke all rules in her interview with the Pope, by imploring him personally to grant her desire. His Holiness answered "My child, do as your Superiors tell you. All is well. If God wants you to enter, you will". In time, the Authorities courageously took the risk, and at fifteen Thérèse became a Postulant.

The second part of the book is an outpouring of love to our Lord and Saviour; the expression of a heartfelt desire to prove this by joyous suffering, a longing to "fill up the sufferings of Christ", and so co-operate in the salvation of the souls of others. Her motto might well have been the words of the great Apostle, "I could wish myself were accursed from Christ for my brethren".

In the concluding section, addressed to the Reverend Mother who succeeded her sister Pauline in that office, we have her little thesis upon Prayer and Sacrifice. That she exemplified her ideals in a degree that surpasses ordinary human attainment is witnessed by the fact that so vast a number of Christians have drawn courage from, and learned endurance by her example and prayers. A second reading of this story produces a much deeper impression than its simplicity and artlessness would suggest could be possible.

T. DILWORTH-HARRISON

## SAINTS AND HEROES

TRUE LIGHTS. By J. W. C. WAND. Mowbrays. 10s. 6d.

NUMEROUS people will have listened at some time or other to Bishop Wand talking on the saints and leaders of the Christian Church—the elderly ladies who used to attend the daily offices when he was an incumbent; the clergy and laity of London who looked forward to a spiritual "feast" each Lent from their Father in God; and that vaster audience who heard these particular talks, which were first broadcast and are now published under the title of *True Lights*. For all of them alike, the experience must have been both edifying and enlightening.

That is because the bishop is able to make the figures of past ages—who to so many people are little more than names on the printed page or in the Church's Kalendar—spring to life. Here, for instance, in a small volume which spans nineteen centuries, and treats of fourteen characters as widely diverse as Clement of Alexandria and Grenfell of Labrador, one really sees men for what they were: Origen as the "Pathfinder", Athanasius as "Defender of the Faith", Gregory as the "Great Prelate". Perhaps the writer is at his very best when he is dealing with the saints

of his own Communion : men such as Nicholas Ferrar, "Contemplative", and John Keble, "Pastor and Scholar".

"Church History for beginners", remarked Dr Wand one day of this book, as if to dismiss it lightly. But even those who are far beyond the beginner stage can learn something from *True Lights*; and there are, no doubt, incumbents who will gladly avail themselves of the opportunity which the book affords of infusing "a little extra variety into weekday services".

GORDON HUELIN

## A DOUBLE PERSONALITY

WILLIAM THOMSON, ARCHBISHOP OF YORK. By H. KIRK-SMITH. S.P.C.K., for the Church Historical Society. 35s.

IT IS not often that the author of a biography can bless his subject and damn him in the same breath, or at least on the same page. Yet that is what Dr Kirk-Smith succeeds in doing, not once but many times. The result is a psychological study very difficult to visualize. We get the impression of an un-integrated personality, a kind of Jekyll and Hyde performance, which retains its incongruity to the end. No doubt the author is right. At any rate the evidence is all there, competently set out and spiced with some most amusing stories. If contemporaries did not record so objective a judgement it was because they all seem to have been strongly partisan, either altogether pro-Thomson, or altogether anti-Thomson. In nothing is the period more unlike our own than in the violence of its likes and dislikes.

What indeed are you to think of a man who can drop the "p" out of his name because it is not sufficiently aristocratic, or who can wreck the peace of his minster by the most absurd quarrels with his dean, or defend himself against attacks which would otherwise have been forgotten the moment after they were made? Yet this was the man who more than any other won Yorkshire for the Church, stopped the anti-religious flood from overwhelming the working-classes, and rivalled Wilberforce in establishing the modern idea of the hard-working diocesan bishop. Born four years after Waterloo and living till the year when free elementary education was established in England, he worked on the watershed between two worlds; and if the Church of England came into the modern period with greater influence and heightened prestige, it was largely because of the efforts of William Thomson. People might laugh at him or sneer at him, but so far as the working-men of Sheffield were concerned he "delivered the goods", even though he did refuse to attend the first Lambeth Conference.

Perhaps the real clue to his character was that he was a born demagogue—a consecrated one certainly—but still a demagogue.

W.W.

## REVALUATION

LANCELOT ANDREWES: 1555-1626. By PAUL A. WELSBY. S.P.C.K. 25s.

IT IS thirty years since Mr T. S. Eliot, emerging from *The Waste Land* but still in the period of what might be called his prematurity, published a small volume of selected essays—*For Lancelot Andrewes: Essays on Style and Order*—which fluttered the devotees of the then prevailing secular humanistic culture. In it he boldly identified himself with a position which had not for many years been regarded in such quarters as intellectually respectable. The declaration in the Preface—"The general point of view may be described as classicist in literature, royalist in politics, and Anglo-Catholic in religion"—and the celebrated footnote on page 89 ("... the spirit killeth, but the letter giveth life") made a resounding impact of which the repercussions have not yet died away; and, in the intellectual climate of 1928, it was obviously and excusably assumed that Mr Eliot was heading for the Church of Rome.

The first essay in the book was on "Lancelot Andrewes". Like all Mr Eliot's writings, it is lucid, brilliant, suggestive, and acute: but, as we can now see, it also contains a number of historical judgements which are extremely controversial. The author was not a professional historian: and in that department he was temerarily venturing into territory in which the kind of people he was challenging were fortunately not qualified to pursue him.

The Right Reverend Father in God, Lancelot Bishop of Winchester, died on September 25, 1626. During his lifetime he enjoyed a distinguished reputation for the excellence of his sermons, for the conduct of his diocese, for his ability in controversy displayed against Cardinal Bellarmine, and for the decorum and devotion of his private life. . . . By authorities on the history of the English Church Andrewes is still accorded a high, perhaps the highest place; . . . a place second to none in the history of the formation of the English Church. (pp. 13, 32.)

This essay rendered valuable service by reviving interest in Bishop Andrewes, who, overshadowed in the field of English studies by the vogue of Donne, had become little more than a name except to those who knew and valued his *Preces Privatae* as a manual of devotion, and to a few old-fashioned clergymen who had read his Sermons of the Nativity and of the Resurrection. As the importance of Jeremy Taylor's *Ductor Dubitantium* has not yet been noticed by students of the history of political thought, so also the importance of Andrewes' Sermons had not yet been discovered by students of the history of English literature, and Mr Eliot's essay put them where they belong.

He was the favourite Court Preacher of King James I and VI, before whom he preached regularly not only at Christmas, Easter, and Whitsun, but also, as Dr Welsby reminds us, on the anniversaries of the Gowrie Conspiracy (5 August) and the Gunpowder Plot (5 November). In consequence there is indeed some very queer stuff (not mentioned by Mr Eliot) within the great folio of the *XCVI Sermons by the Right*

*Honourable and Reverend Father in God, Lancelot Andrewes, late Lord Bishop of Winchester: Published by His Majesties speciall Command* (1629), particularly in the series of sermons "Of the Conspiracy of the Gowries", which follow so incongruously upon the series of fifteen sermons "Of the Sending of the Holy Ghost". Thus, for example, in the second of the Gowrie Conspiracy sermons, preached before King James at Holdenby on 5 August 1607, the Bishop argues that if Abishai and his like, having little or no sense of Religion, are not to be restrained by being told that the King is *Christus Domini*, the Lord's Anointed, then there is no way of more force to forbid high treason

than set a *penalty* on it: specially, the great penalty of all, *death*. And yet, *death* a *Souldier* careth not so much for neither, except it be *mors sontica*, a malefactors death, and the chief malefactors, the *traitors* death, to be *drawn* and *dragged* from his place, as *Joab* (1 Reg. 2. 28); *hanged*, as *Bigthan* (Esth. 2. 22); His bowels pulled out (to suit him to *Judas*, whose *gushed out* of themselves, Acts 1. 18); To have his *heart opened*, yet being alive, as *Absalom* (2 Sam. 18. 14); His *head chopped off*, as *Sheba* (2 Sam. 20. 22); and it and his quarters *hanged up*, as *Baana*, and *Rechabs* were (2 Sam. 4. 11); To have their *lands* and *lively-hoods seized on*, and given to *strangers*; Their *issue miserable* for their sakes: To be *damnatae memoriae*, their name, and memory as a curse: (which three are set downe in the hundreth and ninth *Psalme*, the *Psalme* against *treacherie*). Tell *Abishai* of this, and this may perhaps stay him.

Even when full allowance has been made not only for the callous objectivity with which our ancestors regarded the infliction of barbaric penalties, but also for the exuberance with which the doctrine (grounded in the Old Testament) of the Divine Right of Kings was preached and propagated under the Early Stuarts, the fact remains that this is very extraordinary language for a Bishop to use in a sermon, and particularly for a Bishop who (in the words of Mr Eliot) "enjoyed a distinguished reputation . . . for the decorum and devotion of his private life".

In other words, Lancelot Andrewes emerges even from his sermons as a more ambiguous and enigmatic figure than has been commonly supposed; and Dr Welsby, as the author of the first scholarly and critical biography of "that celebrated Bishop of Winton", who (to quote Bishop Hacket) "was the most Apostolical and Primitive-like Divine, in my Opinion, that wore a Rochet in his Age", has brilliantly elicited and illuminated this ambiguity in a volume which ranks with Mr B. A. Smith's *Dean Church*, Dr H. Kirk-Smith's *Archbishop Thomson*, and Dr H. C. Porter's *Reformation and Reaction in Tudor Cambridge*, as one of the outstanding contributions to ecclesiastical history in a vintage year.

The result is not so much a devaluation of Bishop Andrewes as a reassessment. Dr Welsby is not an iconoclast, although if the Church of England were ever to enlarge its Kalendar by seeking to include Andrewes with others of its own Post-Reformation saints, his book would obviously be useful to the *advocatus diaboli*. But the real text of this volume is a quotation from the Inaugural Lecture of Professor Knowles: "The historian must avoid bestowing upon all the realms of a



man's activity the admiration that is only due in one or some."

As a public figure in the affairs of Church and State, the influence of Andrewes was never decisive. In the Privy Council, in the House of Lords, or on the Court of High Commission, he gives "the negative impression of a man of silence". He was the King's favourite preacher, yet "there is no evidence that James ever took his advice upon anything that really mattered". As a controversialist he was over-valued and not immaculately scrupulous.

"Andrewes was essentially a man of profound learning." He had been a don—Fellow, Catechist, and Master of Pembroke College, Cambridge—and "a predilection for the study" is one of the keys to his character. There was in him a touch of pedantry, most amiably displayed in his encouragement of the Westminster scholars when he was Dean of Westminster: as Hacket wrote, "he never walked to Chiswick for his recreation without a brace of young fry, and in that wayfaring leisure had a singular dexterity to fill those narrow vessels with a funnel". In his disposal of Church patronage, he tended to prefer men of learning, and "was perhaps rather more concerned with scholarship than with souls". Professor Claude Jenkins used to say, with reference to the Puritan objection to pluralities (in an age when the average benefice hardly afforded a living wage), that it could be shown that most of the pluralists were Bachelors or Doctors of Divinity. But this was probably a source of weakness as much as of strength: and the pastoral genius of Anglicanism was better illustrated by the Church Puritans, such as that exemplary parish priest, Richard Greenham of Dry Drayton. Nor, in this connection, can Andrewes be exempted from the charge of nepotism: he heaped preferment after preferment on his unworthy brother, Roger Andrewes. In this, he was a man of his time: but his own financial integrity was never impugned.

His fundamental weakness was his profound and almost mystical belief in the Divine Right of Kings. Throughout the Middle Ages, this theory had rested mainly either on the Old Testament doctrine of the sacrosanctity of the Lord's Anointed, or on the New Testament doctrine of obedience to the powers that be. In the Elizabethan age, the emphasis had been upon submission to "the Magistrate": it was King James who shifted it back to "the Lord's Anointed", and Andrewes swallowed this, hook, line, and sinker. (Clarendon was therefore ill-advised in thinking that it would have been well for the Church of England if Andrewes, and not Abbott, had been translated to Canterbury in 1610: it would in fact have almost certainly precipitated the impending Civil War.) Both in his attitude to the Arminian Controversy in Holland and in his judgement in the Essex Divorce case, Andrewes exhibited a fatal tendency to suppress his own opinions where they ran counter to the wishes of the King; and it is no adequate defence to say that this was for him a matter of principle and not of ordinary sycophancy.

Dr Welsby has not failed to observe that in the *Preces Privatae* "the penitential sections are out of all proportion both in their length and in



the extremity of their language", and he makes telling use of a quotation from Dr Brightman: the *Preces* "represent as a whole what he was and what he aspired to be". He concludes that perhaps Andrewes' nearest title to sainthood is what is there revealed: "that he knew himself to be a sinner."

Yet the impression left by this extremely able and admirably documented work, which will long remain the standard biography of Bishop Andrewes, is not wholly denigratory. What Dr Welsby has given us is a balanced moral evaluation, based upon all the available evidence: and the concluding paragraph of the work is of great importance.

To the *via media* of the English Church, Andrewes brought theological and historical enrichment, investing it with a positive apologia based on Scripture and the Fathers and delivering it from a predominatingly negative defence against Rome or a too close alliance with Calvinism. He demonstrated the fact that Anglicanism had its own body of theology and its own historical continuity, and he thus established its claim to be a true and real part of the Church Catholic of all ages. In the process of this achievement he introduced two other related features which became characteristic of Anglicanism and which differentiated it from both Rome and Geneva—a reserve about points of doctrine which are not central, and a freedom of private judgement outside these central articles of faith. The excesses latent in the latter were restricted by Andrewes' emphasis on the authority of the Church in matters of doctrine which are *de fide* and in matters of Order. In all this Andrewes built something which was to endure, and this important contribution, together with the earlier work of Richard Hooker, set the norm for Anglicanism in the future and survived the doctrinal vicissitudes of succeeding centuries.

The mystery remains—and to Dr Welsby it is a circumstance to be regarded with a certain amount of suspicion—that, unlike most of his episcopal contemporaries, Bishop Andrewes appears to have had no enemies. Here, and here alone, Dr Welsby seems to be a little unjust, and to press too far his hypothesis that Andrewes suffered from a certain "weakness of character which, rather than make enemies, will tend to compromise principle and—perhaps by the negative process of silence—trim the sail to the prevailing wind": for it is a fallacy to suggest that weak men do not make enemies. Dr Welsby is on firmer ground when he goes on to say that "there can be no doubt that Andrewes was a man with a loveable and kindly nature". Perhaps the most striking tribute to his memory is that of Laud, who wrote in his *Diary*: "September 25th, Monday, about four o'clock in the morning, died Lancelot Andrewes, the most worthy bishop of Winchester, the great light of the Christian world." The interesting point about this entry is that if only Andrewes had died four months earlier, Laud himself would have been translated to Winchester, and not to the less important see of Bath and Wells. But he did not have long to wait for London, or for Canterbury.

CHARLES SMYTH

## TEMPLE'S SPEECHES

RELIGIOUS EXPERIENCE: AND OTHER ESSAYS AND ADDRESSES. By WILLIAM TEMPLE. Collected and edited with an Introduction by E. A. BAKER. James Clarke. 21s.

THIS book reproduces twenty-two sermons, addresses, lectures, and pamphlets written by William Temple between 1904 and 1944. They deal with many subjects, from St Thomas Aquinas to Robert Browning, and they exhibit the various aspects of the Archbishop's learning and genius.

Temple was at his best in expounding the basic doctrines of Christianity, and he puts forth his full powers in the masterly lectures on "The Godhead of Jesus" and "The Idea of Immortality in Relation to Religion and Ethics". But perhaps his most characteristic utterances are those concerned with the formulation of Christian social principles and their application in the contemporary world. The chapters on "Christ and the Way to Peace", "Christian Democracy", and "Social Witness and Evangelism" constitute a powerful challenge to Christian thought and action to-day. This book does not compare in value with Temple's major works, but, within its limits, it gives a true impression of his thought. Temple approached Christian theology as a philosopher, and in that capacity he was much influenced by Plato and by Hegel. He made free use of philosophical categories to articulate and explain the Christian faith, and, in so doing, he widened the scope of his apologetic and strengthened its basis. No more illuminating and inspiring message has been given to Christians in the present century.

In his Introduction, Canon Baker surveys the main points in Temple's teaching. A book of this kind, which contains many striking *obiter dicta*, might well have had an index of subjects. There are misprints on pages 51, 89, 130, 214, and 231.

G. J. INGLIS

## OULTON'S FAREWELL

FUNDAMENTALS OF THE FAITH: Papers, Addresses, and Sermons. By J. E. L. OULTON. S.P.C.K. 12s. 6d.

IN THIS book Canon H. M. Harriss has brought together some of the unpublished papers, addresses, and sermons of the late Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Dublin. It begins with a Foreword by the Archbishop of Dublin, followed by a memoir from Canon Harriss's own pen. Of this memoir it need only be said here that it gives a vivid and intimate picture of Oulton as a man, as a parish priest, and as a University Professor.

Of the seven papers hitherto unpublished the one which most discloses the distinctive approach of the late Regius Professor is that on "The theology and practice of Christian Initiation". Here one finds

evidence of exact and careful scholarship, cautious interpretation and judgement, and some of those pungent asides which Oulton was wont to make when he was sure of his audience. Here too are found examples of the somewhat disappointing conclusions at which he sometimes arrived. Thus having surveyed the early history of the practice of baptism and having lightly touched on questions relating to the origin of Confirmation he writes, "Now that the two (Baptism and Confirmation) are separated for us, it does not seem to me desirable that we should aim at precise theological definition concerning the *differentia* between the two rites".

Occasionally Oulton departs from cautious appraisal of views other than his own and imputes non-theological motives to those who held them. An example of this is found in the essay before us when he tells us in effect (pp. 31 and 32) that the new emphasis recently laid on Confirmation arose from a desire to rationalize objections to the scheme for reunion in South India. In the concluding part of the paper too there is unusual passion in Oulton's strictures on the present-day practice of Holy Baptism. From such a mild scholar the use of the word "degradation" here is very strong. "The Church of Ireland", he writes, "continues to cling to a Baptismal office which is generally gloomy and forbidding, often definitely misleading, and largely unintelligible to the majority of those who bring their children to the font." The language is in part explained by the fact that the General Synod had some time previously rejected a proposed revision of the Baptismal office in the drawing up of which Oulton had taken a leading part.

Canon Harriss reproduces sermons preached by Oulton on the Incarnation, the Passion, the Resurrection, the Ascension, the Holy Spirit, and the Holy Trinity. The book closes with a last sermon preached shortly before Oulton's unexpected death. All these sermons will repay careful reading, not least the sustained and poignant meditation on the *Magnificat* which Oulton delivered in St John's, Monkstown, on Christmas Day, 1938.

R. R. HARTFORD

### HAPPY WORKER

HUGH COMPTON WARNER. By N. le P. WARNER. S.P.C.K. 15s. 6d.

TO THOSE of us who grew up in the period between the wars, the biography of Hugh Warner will come as something of a thrill. For it is so very much our own story. Do we begin to forget how the colossus William Temple bestrode the scene and how much we owe to the S.C.M.? This story will remind us of these things and show us how much Hugh Warner was shaped by them.

The climax of his work was the short period which he spent with the Moral Welfare Council. His skill in dealing with individuals and his flair

for journalism made him exactly the right man for this job; yet it is fair to wonder whether the incumbency at Epsom was not really the most influential part of his life's work. It may be an encouragement to many a parish priest to learn how much a nimble-minded and energetic incumbent can touch the life of a community. The vocation of the Anglican parish system is strongly vindicated when such men as Hugh Warner exist to give it significance.

This is a beautifully printed and produced book, written with loving discernment by his wife. Its readers owe her a debt not only for telling her story but also for providing what was obviously an affectionate family background from which no doubt was born a concern to help those whose lives might have been failures or tragedies precisely at that point.

Throughout his course the keynote of his personality was a manifestation of Christian joy. "Eee, he has such a happy face", exclaimed the old Yorkshire woman at Bishopthorpe; and at the very end, the message was the same. From the depths of his pain, he said, "When you speak at your next meeting, you must speak about Christian joy". Because Hugh Warner knew and testified that Christian joy means essentially enjoying God, the story of his life is an eloquent witness to the reality of the second of the Pauline fruits of the Spirit.

J. S. LEATHERBARROW

## THE WAY

THE PARTING OF THE WAY: Lao Tzu and the Taoist Movement. By HOLMES WELCH. Methuen. 21s.

THIS is a well-written, comprehensive, interesting, and reliable introduction to Taoism, in the many very different forms which this has assumed through the centuries. It might be thought that Taoism, except as a farrago of popular superstitions, belongs entirely to the past. But Dr Joseph Needham has recently argued that "even though Taoism as an organised religion is dead or dying, perhaps the future belongs to their philosophy". And Dr Lin Yü-t'ang holds that "if there is one book that can claim to interpret for us the spirit of the Orient, or that is necessary to the understanding of characteristic Chinese behaviour, . . . it is Laotse's *Book of Tao*" (this is the same book that Dr Welch calls by the more usual name *Tao Te Ching*).

Dr Welch treats Lao Tzu (Laotse) as the otherwise unknown author of the *Tao Te Ching*, which he puts in the fourth century B.C., and makes no attempt to go into the insoluble problem of whether or not there was a sixth century sage with this name.

Our author argues interestingly against the traditional picture of the Taoist, accepted by Mr Waley, as essentially a hermit who does not leave his mountain hut: seclusion, admittedly, is necessary for any Taoist, but it is necessary in varying degrees, and once the work of

seclusion is done, every Taoist, whether layman, ruler, or sage, returns to live in the world. But though many Taoists did and do live in the world, the typical and ideal Taoist remains the hermit on the mountain-side.

Dr Welch also argues that the Taoist *wu wei* (inaction) in itself means not avoiding the unnatural, but avoiding the aggressive. The least convincing point in Lao Tzu's philosophy he considers to be the premise that man's original nature is free from hostility and aggressiveness.

We are glad to see that Dr Welch does not fall into the trap of treating the Christian returning of good for evil and the Taoist requiting of hatred with virtue as on exactly the same footing. We could wish that he had discussed what Dr H. H. Rowley has written on this in his *Submission in suffering and other essays in Eastern thought*, and indeed this book might have replaced some others in Dr Welch's bibliography (Francis C. M. Wei's *The Spirit of Chinese culture* should also have been included).

The claim (p. 4) that no other book except the Bible has been translated into English so often as the Tao Te Ching is hardly credible: Dr Welch lists thirty-five such translations, not all of them complete: surely Homer and Horace, for example, have been translated more often. But no doubt the Tao Te Ching has been translated more often than any other Chinese book.

There is a good index and bibliography: and the book is to be warmly welcomed.

G. F. S. GRAY

## THE NATURE OF MAN

THE RISE AND FALL OF THE INDIVIDUAL. By W. P. WITCUTT. S.P.C.K. 12s. 6d.

VISIBLE AND INVISIBLE: Christian Affirmations in a Secular Age. By GIOVANNI MIEGGE, translated by STEPHEN NEILL. Mowbray. 15s.

MR WITCUTT'S book is stimulating. It contains an enormous number of disputable statements. Some relate to whole periods of human history, and only a Toynbee could say whether they are true. Others briefly describe movements of thought upon which authors writing at great length have not ventured to come to any decided opinion. Others again are estimates of famous individuals which utterly contradict accepted opinion. Yet Mr Witcutt's courage justifies itself. His story—he is writing the story of mankind—is told with so much energy and movement that it has the solemnity of history without missing the charm of fiction. Furthermore a thesis underlies it, which might perhaps be stated in the following terms: the mind of man in early times entertained several different views of human life and society which had value, but they were inadequate because purely intellectual and speculative; the Christian religion brought the Will into the picture, a very powerful agent, which has produced the New Man and the Modern World;



unfortunately Christianity was Platonized, and has consequently gone utterly astray; Man without God is Nothing; God must be brought in as God once more. As you read this book you will catch yourself constantly saying that Mr Witcutt is quite wrong, but as often you will be saying that possibly he is right, and that it is terribly interesting to think he may be.

*Visible and Invisible* is on the same topics—history, the nature of Man, Man's destiny—but it is quite a different kind of book. It is, as it is bound to be, since Bishop Stephen Neill approves of it, a good book, but it is not an attractive book. It is full of deep speculation of a serious and often valuable character, but it does not seem to be making much progress. Many readers will go out by the same door that they came in. This is not due to the matter which is solid (though rather up-to-date), but to the half-technical and half-obsolescent terms in which this kind of theology has come to express itself, not only here, but in whole rows of volumes. It makes one wish that this school of writers, who certainly have something to say, would read Hume and study Hume and imitate Hume, and leave out what cannot be communicated in the language of Hume, though one must add of course that Hume might have learnt something by studying books like theirs.

ADAM FOX

## THE TELEOLOGY OF FAITH

THE SCEPTICAL APPROACH TO RELIGION. By PAUL ELMER MORE. Princeton University Press. London: Oxford University Press. 28s.

IT IS significant that these essays, first delivered as lectures in the United States, have been printed four times previously. To what was the demand due?

In looking for an answer to this question I could not but come to the conclusion that it was not to be found in the presentation of the sceptical approach which, although sympathetic, is not adequate for the twentieth century but might have been relevant two hundred years ago. Elmer More does not in fact give much space to the sceptical approach and does not go beyond Hume, except for brief references to a few later philosophers.

His answer to the sceptic is not to be found in a rational justification of Theism, because he agrees with him that "of all the rational attempts to demonstrate the existence of God—and I have read many from Plato's time to those of the present day—not one is logically coercive". More's basic conviction, to which he gives explicit expression at least twice, is that "the sum of wisdom comes to this: Man is intellectually impotent and morally responsible". He reaches this conclusion from a study of Plato's account of the human situation. Although to some Christians this view will be acceptable, to many others it will be repugnant as derogatory to the concepts of God and man and con-

demnatory also of all intellectual exercises, including More's own essays.

In view of his conviction it is understandable that More's answer to the sceptical approach is that of the inference of faith from intuition. St Thomas Aquinas is ignored. Spinoza's philosophy is given some consideration as an example of the inadequacy of the concept of Deity which results from a rational approach. In similar strain More concludes that Kant's "boasted escape from scepticism proves to be perfectly futile" and "his deity and categorical imperative and teleology turn out to be precisely the Spinozistic absolutes masquerading under other names".

Despite man's intellectual impotence his need, because of his moral responsibility, is for a teleology. This is a foundation stone of More's position and it is in his interesting exposition of this thesis that the value of his book is to be found. For this alone it is well-worth reading. "As Platonism is the only philosophy which independently developed a high form of teleology, so Christianity is the only completely teleological religion of the world." Greek philosophy prior to Socrates "formulated that conception of the world as a self-expanding entity which has characterized, and still characterizes, our western scientific mode of thought". Plato, indebted to his master Socrates, effected a revolution of thought in his "completely teleological philosophy by developing on parallel lines the doctrine of Ideas and the belief in God as two co-operative causes of order in the phenomenal world of our observation". Of all the religions only Christianity as the "genuine *telos* of Judaism" reached and retained the monotheistic position coupled with a teleology which constitutes a purposive evolution. As such it is the successor to and culmination of the Platonic revolution.

In brief, the answer to the sceptic is that he cannot in fact be agnostic, and that either he submits to "the very horror of a world devoid of anything answering to human purpose" or he accepts the Christian intuitively derived faith for "a reason of the heart deeper than any reason of the brain".

C. T. CHAPMAN

## TAKING THINGS PHILOSOPHICALLY

THIS IS MY PHILOSOPHY. Edited by WHIT BURNETT. Allen & Unwin. 25s.

MATTER, MIND AND MAN. By EDMUND W. SINNOTT. Allen & Unwin. 18s.

WHITEHEAD'S METAPHYSICS. By IVOR LECLERC. Allen & Unwin 21s.

"HE TAKES everything very philosophically", we say of the man who faces life with equanimity, who has some over-all world view enabling him to see a pattern in the jig-saw of experience. These three books provide an interesting illustration of what can be meant by saying, like this, that a man takes a "philosophical outlook" on life.

In the first book, some twenty "outstanding thinkers" of the world give what is called their "personal philosophy", the "deepest meaning" they have found in life. A few happen to be professional philosophers—Russell, Maritain, Jaspers, Marcel, and Sartre, for example. But for the most part the contributors have more distinction in other fields. There are Radhakrishnan and Oppenheimer, G. M. Trevelyan and J. B. S. Haldane. Of variety there is no end: there is a Spaniard who lives at Oxford; there is a Russian-born sociologist who is now a naturalized American. If I were to award a prize, it would go to Russell for a crisp expression of his "philosophy" in four pages, concluding with an "unconquerable" persuasion which is nevertheless "beyond all reason". But the book as a whole is by no means the rag-bag which might have been expected, though to avoid mental indigestion the reader should take the contributors very much one at a time. Yet at the end will he not be a little depressed? The "seasoned reflections" of these twenty men rarely harmonize. Where indeed, is wisdom to be found?

To go further, we should have to compare of course the wider backgrounds in which these "seasoned reflections" are set and from which they take their rise. We should have to ask each contributor to develop his world-view, to set before us his "philosophy" in a more thorough-going fashion. It is something like this which Dr Sinnott does for us in the second book. We are still some way from the professional philosopher doing philosophy, but Dr Sinnott tries to trace a key-idea through the whole of existence. Recognizing the challenging character of contemporary scientific investigations into man's personality, Dr Sinnott tries to look at life not "as a random pattern of proteins" but "as the first step of a stairway that leads up to the Divine", and this vision arises when he takes "protoplasmic self-regulation" as a "goal-seeking" which reaches its highest expression in Spirit. Self-regulation, purposiveness, creativity—here are concepts in terms of which the whole Universe can be understood, and from this standpoint Dr Sinnott criticizes all mind-body dualisms (and even parallelisms), besides outlining more constructively the kind of thinking about freedom, justice, sin, beauty, death which arises on his view. Here is a thoroughgoing book, obviously well-informed on the scientific side, but it leaves unanswered many problems which arise when we try to base a metaphysics on biological concepts.

So we come naturally to Whitehead: a giant indeed, vast in his range of interests and a master of both critical and speculative philosophy. But have not many considered Whitehead's terminology so novel as to be unintelligible, and *Process and Reality*, his great Gifford Lectures, unreadable? Have we here a philosopher so professional as to have no "deepest meanings" to give to anybody? Dr Leclerc, justly claiming that the difficulty of Whitehead has been "greatly exaggerated by incorrect or misleading approaches", put us all in his debt for an introduction to Whitehead which develops the major themes of Whitehead's metaphysics in relation to the issues and problems which Whitehead was facing. The result is that we have a book, closely based on Whitehead's

own words, which shows us how, from certain problems, Whitehead developed his distinctive method and concepts. It is an inspiring and an illuminating exposition, and those who want to have "seasoned reflections" of their own could do nothing better than to read such a giant as Whitehead under the careful and informed guidance of Dr Leclerc.

I. T. RAMSEY

## PSYCHOLOGY QUESTIONED

JUNG AND THE PROBLEM OF EVIL. By H. L. PHILP. Rockliff. 30s.

THE unusual structure and manner of this book make it curiously difficult to read, but it is well worth the effort. Much of the difficulty is indeed due to the inherent complexity and elusiveness of Jung's psychological theories, and the value of the book is that it provides not only a careful statement of those theories but a great deal of first-hand material contributed by Jung himself. Not only are there very full quotations of relevant material from Jung's writings, but there are direct answers by Jung to two questionnaires, the first forming the basis upon which the book is founded, the second giving Jung the last word in answer to queries summarizing Dr Philp's criticisms of Jung's *Answer to Job*. A great part of the intervening material is written in the second person, and so addressed to Jung personally, and this at times has a distracting effect. And in the second part of the book, where Jung's *Answer to Job* is first summarized and then firmly criticized it is not always clear at sight whether Dr Philp is speaking for Jung or for himself, or whether he is really addressing Jung or his own readers.

The debate turns upon three main topics, Jung's attack upon the conception of evil as *privatio boni*, his claim that the Christian conception of God as Trinity demands completeness by the inclusion of God's shadow side, Satan and evil itself, in a Quaternity, and his assertion that what Christianity lacks is met by his theory of Individuation, in which the Self, the archetypal "God within", has, as the Mandala shows, precisely this four-fold character. It is really valuable to have all this worked out in detail in a living and frank debate with Jung himself. One point at least comes out perhaps more clearly than anywhere in Jung's writings. Jung's concept of God is psychological and not metaphysical. He repudiates again and again any attempt to give his account of the God-archetype any status in ontological reality other than the reality of the experience in which we meet it. For all the psychological complexity of his analysis Jung remains a simple Kantian when it comes to metaphysics. As a theologian Dr Philp answers him readily enough, but his withers are unwrung.

L. W. GRENSTED

## RELIGIOUS PHILOSOPHY

LANGUAGE AND CHRISTIAN BELIEF. By JOHN WILSON. Macmillan. 9s. 6d.

THIS is a useful, if sometimes vulnerable, defence of religious statements, from the viewpoint of the contemporary movement in philosophy, as genuinely informative because verifiable by "religious experience". The kind of experience the author seems to have in mind is one available to anyone taking the proper steps to obtain it; but to require so close a correspondence between religious and sense-experience leaves no real place (in spite of his title) for revealed religion, which (unlike the more diffuse forms of mystical intuition) is not arrived at by this kind of experimental method. It is not therefore surprising to find that when he comes to discuss authority Mr Wilson betrays no awareness that this can mean, even in theology, anything but the authority of the expert; the idea of revealed truth as in some sense self-authenticating falls right outside his field of vision.

His other chapters apply his methods to specific problems in theology. Here the reader can expect analytical acuteness, which is the logician's business, rather than theological penetration, which is not; for all that, the usefulness of his discussion turns out to be in direct proportion to his theological grasp of the issues discussed, which is in some cases excellent. He is least successful with the sacraments, where he fails to distinguish the *ex opere operato* conception from the magical, and is misleading about the relation of historical evidence to positions held by faith.

The style is non-technical and readable, if inclined at times to patronize the reader; these being the virtues and the defect of writing with one eye on the sixth-former.

HUMPHREY GREEN

## EACH MAN'S CREED

MY KEY TO LIFE. Edited by KENNETH ULYETT. Skeffington. 15s.

ANOTHER symposium! One can understand the serious reader glancing at the list of contributors, and shutting the book. It is such well-travelled ground:

So many Gods, so many creeds,  
So many paths that wind and wind  
When just the art of being kind  
Is all this sad world needs!

When the popular daily is at a loss for silly season topics, it produces a series upon "My Creed", and usually treats us to the lucubrations of a variety of "stars" who appear to compose their beliefs as the ink flows from their pens.



Here Mr Kenneth Ulyett has prevailed upon fifteen well-known men and women to enunciate the secret of their happiness. Three are avowed Anglicans, three faithful Roman Catholics; Nonconformity is represented by Dr "Billy" Graham—and the rest are fellow travellers.

Lord Listowel, born with a golden spoon in his mouth, early reacted against the selfish wealth of his circle, and describes himself as a secular Christian, inspired by the highest ideals of Socialism. Sir Miles Thomas, of B.O.A.C. and Nuffield Organization fame, was nurtured in the narrower kind of Welsh Dissent, and, in reaction from this, declares himself still a Seeker. "Truth is many sided, and has more facets than one man alone will ever grasp." To him the important thing is always to be a quick and willing pupil.

Mrs Ronald Bowes-Lyon, brought up, as she says, in S.W. Africa in an "orthodox and Christian" way, has sympathies with the Plymouth Brethren, Quakers, and Gideonites, but sent her son to a Jesuit School. She was not displeased when he stated, just before his war service, what his view of life was: "I found his philosophy was characteristically simple. 'The fact is, Mother,' he said, 'a chap ought to make sure nobody can get the better of him.'" (The lad crashed and was killed soon after his twenty-first birthday.) But Mrs Bowes-Lyon believes that the Key of life is "to see a goal in life, and to march there, with the props of a simple faith, as strength and support".

Miss Barbara Cartland, playwright and television personality, is frankly a Theosophist. "We must throw away all the nauseating self-pity of thinking that we are 'miserable sinners'. We are nothing of the sort. We are glorious wonderful people, made in the image of God." But by "we" she appears to mean something less than humanity, for she avers as her creed: "In this uncertain, dangerous and difficult world, I am certain only of two things: my faith in God and my faith in the English people."

Danny Kaye's creed is summed up in that he holds "the inalienable right of every human being to function, in the way best suited for himself, for four and twenty hours a day. I believe that more passionately than anything else in the world."

Who would have thought that Gilbert Harding was once a seminarist at Mirfield? Though he became a Roman Catholic, he retains a cheerful charity and breadth of mind which does not always characterize converts. Lord Richard Alton, who shares the same faith, expresses the same generous outlook. They can afford to do so, since they realize that the means of Grace ordained for us is temporal, the end eternal.

The Archbishop of Capetown and "Billy" Graham both say what we should expect them respectively to say, and say it well. Perhaps the most valuable feature of this book is that it reveals how much more stable and at peace are those who hold fast the fundamental dogmas of the Christian Faith. But how, even in the days of the soul's awakening, the blank wall of materialism so often excludes the vision of Faith.

T. DILWORTH-HARRISON

## CHRISTIAN ASCETICISM

ST METHODIUS: THE SYMPOSIUM, A TREATISE ON CHASTITY. Translated and annotated by HERBERT MUSURILLO, S.J. (Ancient Christian Writers, vol. xxvii.) Longmans. 21s.

FR MUSURILLO's careful study of the text and his erudite notes maintain the high standard of this patristic series. It will further that welcome revival of the study of the Fathers amongst Christian students; for it is very desirable that we should study the stock from which we have sprung, and we shall find such historical study both a cordial for drooping spirits and a warning for ardent spirits.

Despite some over-confident remarks of his admirer, St Jerome, all that we can know for certain about St Methodius is that he was a Christian teacher of the latter part of the third century, who knew the locality of Lycia and may perhaps have been a bishop and a martyr. Fr Musurillo has no biographical information to add to the 1882 volume of the *Dictionary of Christian Biography*.

Indisputably it is a pale imitation of Plato's *Symposium* that Methodius has produced; he has sprinkled his pages with phrases of his master, but he has replaced Plato's flesh and blood disputants by a group of virgins, mere card-board figures, without any real individuality, but all alike allegorizing biblical texts.

His Jesuit translator admits that "Methodius' work at times reflects the cobwebbed clutter mind of the pedant, never profound enough to be satisfying, full of good intentions, but deeply illogical and emotional. His theological outlook, despite its range, is profoundly anthropocentric; his asceticism self-centred and meticulous" (p. 21).

Modern biblical scholars are concerned to find a rightful place for typology in exegesis. Modern theologians see the need to enunciate the principles underlying vocation both to marriage and to celibacy. A reading of this easy flowing translation of St Methodius proves that for these tasks enthusiasm is not enough.

S. M. GIBBARD, S.S.J.E.

## STEPS TO REVISION

PRAYER BOOK REVISION IN THE CHURCH IN WALES. By EWART LEWIS. Church in Wales Provincial Council for Education. 6s.

MR LEWIS is the secretary of the Standing Liturgical Commission of the Church in Wales. We may therefore presume that although this book is not an official publication, it gives us a dependable insight into the atmosphere in which revision of the Prayer Book (1662) proceeds in Wales, and the condition of liturgical studies there. Its primary purpose, however, is to persuade the doubtful that revision is necessary (archaic language and rubrics, the need to incorporate modern theological and

liturgical perceptions, many other provinces of the Anglican Communion are doing it); to set out the legal framework within which revision is carried out; and to give an account of what the Commission has achieved in the revised Lectionary and Table of Proper Psalms (1956) and the revised orders of Baptism and Confirmation (1957).

E. C. WHITAKER

## WORSHIP IN THE DAY SCHOOL

THE OXFORD BOOK OF SCHOOL WORSHIP. PART II JUNIORS, PART III SENIORS. Issued by the Oxford Diocesan Council of Education. S.P.C.K. 10s. 6d.

THERE are a very large number of books on the market to-day offering suggestions for teachers who have the responsibility of conducting School Assembly Prayers. The Education Act of 1944 makes the provision of a Christian Act of Worship obligatory at the beginning of each school-day. Those in use amongst the schools of the Local Educational Authorities tend to follow the same general pattern containing prayer, praise, and extracts from the Bible. The best of these seek to establish three factors in the overall plan. In the first place, the worship must be concise and clear in its central theme, or the interest of the children will wane. Secondly, the children must be given an active part in the performance of the Act. Thirdly, there should be planned variety from day to day.

The revised edition of the Oxford Book of School Worship provides for all these things and is re-issued after twenty years of use in the schools of that Diocese. Compiled originally for Church Schools, it contains a considerable amount of material taken from the Book of Common Prayer. The simple grandeur of its language makes an irresistible appeal to the ears of quite young children and it is a sound educational policy to train children in the use of the actual forms of the ritual they will hear when they attend public worship outside of school hours. Since 1944 many schools in the Oxford Diocese have adopted Controlled Status and it has been found that these and, indeed, a number of the County Schools, in accordance with the recommendation of many modern Agreed Syllabuses, wish to use the traditional form of Church worship in their daily prayers. This volume provides all this and more in a simple and well arranged form.

FRANK A. F. POULDEN

## EUCCHARISTIC QUERIES

THE MYTH OF THE AUMBRY. By S. J. P. VAN DIJK, O.F.M., and J. HAZELDEN WALKER. Burns and Oates. 10s. 6d.

THE CELEBRANT AND MINISTERS OF THE EUCHARIST. By R. C. MORTIMER. Mowbray. 4s. 6d.

THE POETRY OF THE EUCHARIST. By F. J. E. RABY. Mowbray. 4s. 6d. Not infrequently in his writing the late Dom Gregory Dix showed signs of allowing the imaginative historian in him to get the better of the judicious student. Certainly it made his work lively and readable, but for that reason was all the more dangerous, in that it tended to dull the edge of critical awareness in both him and his readers. And when to this flair for vivid narrative was added the delight of baiting the "establishment", the impishness of an *enfant terrible* was inclined to triumph boldly over scholastic caution.

Nowhere is this weakness more apparent than in the delicious *jeu d'esprit*, *A Detection of Aumbries*. The very title prepares one for Dix at his naughtiest. The late Dr N. P. Williams with his *Northern Catholicism*, the bishops with their 1928 aumbries, the late Dean of Chichester with his Alcuin Club—he will make merry with them all and prove that their love was not, as they thought, an English, but a Roman maid. It was Rome who was liturgically severe and restrained; it was Rome who preferred the aumbry to the hanging pyx; it was Rome who hesitated about adoration of the sacrament or processions of the host: she was finally dragged unwillingly along at the heels of an exuberant "Northern Catholicism".

Such was the thesis. Now it has been subjected to a minute and devastating criticism by Fr van Dijk and Mrs Hazelden Walker; Rome and Canterbury join forces to demolish it, in *The Myth of the Aumbry*. It is not an easy book to read. The style of writing is laboured and difficult, and the complexity of the historical matter does not make for clarity. In places it is unpleasantly tart and caustic about Dom Gregory, though one must confess that he does appear to have laid himself open to criticism in an unacknowledged and sometimes unverified use of previously published material. In their reply, the authors take care to present an exceptionally well documented work, and they seem to have proved their main points.

Dix based his theme on the Lateran decree *Sane* (1215), which orders that the sacrament should be kept under lock and key, and argued that this implied the use of the aumbry—a form of reservation which, he said, was the commonest Italian and Roman practice. Van Dijk and Walker maintain that *Sane* was merely a regulation against careless reservation and did not exclude the hanging pyx, or indeed a locked pyx standing on the altar, of which they give instances from Franciscan and Augustian *Ordinationes* of the thirteenth century, which are based on customs of the papal court. The idea that aumbries were demanded by the decree *Sane* falls, therefore, to the ground, and with it

Dom Gregory's theory about the contumacy of the English clergy who, he claimed, insisted on retaining the hanging pyx for purposes of sacramental devotion.

Likewise, they say, Dom Gregory was mistaken in arguing that processions of the sacrament develop from Lanfranc's Palm Sunday procession at Canterbury. Rather are they a development of the simple viaticum procession, and it was Pope Honorius III who ordered that the sacrament should be treated with particular ceremonial reverence, both in the elevation at Mass and in the viaticum procession.

In general they maintain—and the many references they give seem abundantly sufficient—that there is no historical basis in thirteenth-century evidence for drawing any clearly defined distinction between north and south Europe as regards either the place of reservation or devotional attitude to the sacrament. Local custom varied, as always, but it was not based on devotional presuppositions. Dom Gregory's thesis was a product of his own fertile imagination: "he preferred personal deductions to historic facts".

The other two books begin a series of "Studies in Eucharistic Faith and Practice" under the editorship of Dr F. L. Cross. In *The Celebrant and Ministers of the Eucharist*, by the Bishop of Exeter, the information given is so compressed and the reader is flitted about from century to century in so bewildering a manner, frequently without dates being given, that its value is likely to be restricted to those who already have a considerable background of liturgical history. But within its limits it is a useful historical account of the threefold ministry in relation to the Eucharist, showing how, from the bishop as primitive celebrant with priests and deacons assisting, presbyteral celebration emerged and became the norm, though relics of the earlier usage continued, and still persist in the Roman ordination rite. An interesting note on the diaconate points out that the deacons were originally the normal ministers of the sacrament to the laity, but that in the west their liturgy has gradually declined until, with the withdrawal of the cup from the laity, in Rome it has almost ceased to exist.

Dr Raby's essay on *The Poetry of the Eucharist* also suffers from compression within forty pages. But the careful footnotes and the bibliography will, as he suggests in the preface, serve as a guide to further reading. The greater part of the book gives a valuable synopsis of Greek and Latin eucharistic hymnody; the remainder deals with devotions in the vernacular from England, Spain, Germany, Italy, and France. Dr Raby rightly emphasizes the interest and importance of the eucharistic hymns of John and Charles Wesley, which have been so strangely neglected by the Church which was their mother, and to which they claimed allegiance to the end.

G. B. TIMMS



## CHARLES WESLEY'S HYMNS

WESLEY'S PRAYERS AND PRAISES. Edited by J. ALAN KAY. Epworth. 15s.

NO CHRISTIANS sing hymns more than do the Methodists. The contrast between their full-throated congregational attack and the listlessness of many Anglican congregations and their dependence upon a distant choir provides one of those "non-theological factors" which help to keep us apart. But more important than the way they sing are the words they sing. As we read in the recently-published *Interim Statement of Conversations between the Church of England and the Methodist Church*, "The Hymn Book has moulded the spirit and devotion of Methodism as much perhaps as the Book of Common Prayer has influenced the Church of England". H. P. Liddon once wrote to Scott Holland that "in Protestant Germany the infidelity of the pulpit has been constantly neutralized by the *Gesangbuch*". In Methodism the Hymn Book can rarely have been called upon to exercise so radical a compensation; but it has no doubt been the means by which the vagaries or trivialities of preachers have had to find their level alongside the orthodox theology of the Wesleys.

Charles Wesley wrote more than 5,500 hymns in all. So large a production was an invitation to the oblivion into which most of them must have passed. But it is often for quite accidental reasons that one hymn acquires popularity while another is neglected. In this volume the Reverend J. Alan Kay has prepared a noteworthy *salon des refusés*, and goes far to substantiate his claim that "there are hymns in this selection which are as great as any in common use". In a critical introduction he maintains that the varied emphases in Charles Wesley's religious experience which find expression in his hymns, have special significance for our day. Not least valuable is the emphasis on reverence. "A short time ago a little Mission Hall in the north of England invited passers-by to join the congregation in worship by exhibiting a notice which said: 'Drop in and have a little chat with your heavenly Father.' That is the very antithesis of Wesley's way. For him, to worship is not to have 'a little chat'; it is to 'tremble at (His) glory's height, And, lost in silent praise, adore'. He does not think we drop in for it; we come because we have been 'Ordained, prepared, disposed, By (God's) preventing grace.' And although he rejoices in the fact that God is indeed our heavenly Father, he believes that His heavenliness is as important as His fatherhood; He is 'The Father shining on His throne', the 'Father of uncreated light', the 'Father of endless majesty'."

These hymns have been prepared "for use mainly in private devotion"; and they will prove a valuable devotional manual—for Anglicans as much as for Methodists. For Charles Wesley was, after all, a priest of the Church of England, who deplored all acts which foreboded separation. One section of these hymns, for example, is of Prayers for Use by Servants of the Church, with the sub-headings, For

a Chorister, For a Physician, For Teachers and Leaders, For Preachers, For a Candidate for the Ministry, For Ordinands, For Ministers, For an Aged Minister before Preaching. A verse from the hymn for a Chorister suggests the quality of the writing:

If well I know the tuneful art  
To captivate a human heart,  
The glory, Lord, be Thine;  
A servant of Thy blessed will  
I here devote my utmost skill  
To sound the praise divine.

The Editor has done well to point out the Scriptural reference of verse after verse of these hymns. But there can be reference to the Fathers also, as in the simple prayer for unity, which ends,

Oh let us find the ancient way  
Our wondering foes to move,  
And force the heathen world to say,  
'See how these Christians love'.

A use of this volume by members of the Church of England in meditation and prayer might well help towards such a consummation.

H. G. G. HERKLOTS

## ANGLICANS UNDER FIRE

TWO ANGLICAN ESSAYS. By LORD ALTRINCHAM. Secker and Warburg. 10s. 6d.

ESSAYS IN ANGLICAN SELF-CRITICISM. Edited by D. M. PATON. S.C.M. 25s.

Too many thoughtful layman shrug their shoulders at the Church of England, smile and turn away: Lord Altrincham thinks it worth saving. His book reflects the views and queries of an important cross-section of intelligent young adults—echoes of question time in the padre's hour. The long ordained may smile or snort (according to temperament) at the brushing aside of scriptural authority (pp. 19ff), the Communion (very nearly, pp. 21 and 45), the Atonement (p. 24), the Incarnation (p. 30), heaven and hell (pp. 35f): but what the intelligent layman wants is not a smile or a snort, but reason for believing these things—not historical evidence so much as relevance for life to-day. Nor will he accept reasons given in a rarefied jargon, in an atmosphere of *odium theologicum*. Lord Altrincham's second essay is an account of the work of his prophet, F. D. Maurice, whose gospel he accepts while rejecting the creed on which it was founded. His first essay combines the soundest views on practical issues—part time ministry, clerical celibacy and poverty, the parochial system, Convocation and Church Assembly—with demands

for a kind of Hindu comprehensiveness in doctrine. This is a book worth disagreeing with—and answering.

If the Anglican tradition is worth saving, the second book should show some ways of saving it. For this the first three essays are a little disappointing, not because they are not good and true but because they are not constructive: nor are they really self-critical: the authors look into the scrum from the three-quarter line, and grumble because the ball does not come out. Most parish priests know that what Mr Nicholls says is true; we must face the problems and potentialities of our age. But how? Mr Wren-Lewis hits hard at those parish priests who manage to do a bit of reading between 10.0 p.m. and midnight—but still not enough to avoid the perils of a little knowledge: but if they misinterpret Einstein, he underestimates Jung (whom I have read!). His blows are fair enough, but they discourage the triers. Mr Munby shoots at the Platonists, including the Archbishop of York, from (I suspect) a nominalist stronghold: even the highest technical competence is warped in a fallen world.

The next three essays are genuine missionary self-criticism. I give the thoughts which each roused, directly or indirectly. Discipline and its rules are best framed by indigenous Christians in each culture area, and not dictated from outside: paternal guidance must walk hand-in-hand with humility: the most understanding foreign missionary is the one who knows he can never fully understand another culture. But Mr Welbourn's essay is not improved by his contemptuous reference to Lugard on p. 59. Mr Murray Rogers rightly insists on the principle of exchange: Christian truth is not modified or enlarged by Hindu, Buddhist, or Moslem truth—but those religions may contain Christian truths which we have forgotten or misused. The Reverend Chao Fu-San is enthusiastic for the present regime and Church in China: he writes from the top of the swing of the pendulum; the old system was not as black as it is painted; nor are the past missionaries to be condemned with the mistakes of the system.

Mr Hensman, on the problem of communication, is not a good example: he is a trifle obscure. But he says something important. Between us and non-Christians, paradox can only be resolved in charity. Miss Batten has good ideas for reforming the parish system: she is quite definite but not in a hurry. The Reverend M. J. M. Paton does not believe that bishops are "lawful authority": for a parish priest surely they must be—each his own bishop: but in a very good essay he makes the case fairly for and against establishment. No less good is Mr Taylor's awful warning against legalism and rigidity: when Caesar's methods get into the government of the Church—well, he shows from the mission field what happens. Dr Anthony Hanson is most impressive in his advocacy of the eucharistic liturgy of the C.S.I., for its wholeness and clarity. The Church lost its doctrinal balance not at the Reformation, but at the Eastern Schism: until we regain contact with the Orthodox Church, we shall be out of gear: there is much in what Mr Allchin says.

Dr John Marsh and Dr T. F. Torrance help us to see ourselves as we are seen. We could be expounders of Thomism and ambassadors of true

episcopacy (Dr Marsh). We are Ebionites and Pelagians, without proper horror at the sin of division: but if we could forget our Anglicanism and remember our Christianity, we could have "a very definite mission to fulfil" (Dr Torrance). This criticism is supplemented by another good essay from South India, from Bishop Hollis, who charges us with lack of charity—quite justly. A memorable concluding essay from Mr John Lawrence, on the Anglican vocation—a real and indeed indispensable job to be done—completes a collection of essays which we owe to the Reverend D. M. Paton. This collection, with Lord Altrincham's book, sets the stage for some clear thinking, followed by decisive (but not hasty) action.

H. A. BLAIR

### LAMBETH: FOR AND AGAINST

LAMBETH SPEAKS. By DEWI MORGAN. Mowbray. 5s.

LAMBETH 1958 AND YOU. S.P.C.K. 1s. 6d.

LAMBETH 1958 AND CHRISTIAN UNITY. By E. L. MASCALL. Faith Press. 9d.

THESE three items make a mixed bag. The first two are popular presentations of the Lambeth Conference, while the third is a pamphlet bitterly attacking some of the conclusions of the Conference on the subject of Christian unity.

*Lambeth Speaks* was published on the 3 October, a remarkable achievement for the production of a book on the subject. It is a competent presentation of the main themes of the Conference, and is well suited to its principal aim, which is presumably to encourage people to notice and to think about what the Lambeth Conference said. There are a few minor errors, and there is room for difference of opinion about emphasis here and there, but the author has done an excellent job in a very short time.

The S.P.C.K. publication is a picture magazine of the Conference and its subjects with articles by various bishops. The pictures are interesting and well arranged, but, as might be expected, the articles vary in quality. One must presume that the intention of this brochure was to present the Conference in popular and readable form. Some bishops are capable of writing with popular appeal and some are not: both kinds contribute to this booklet. For really popular reading there is probably too much text, printed too small, but it is difficult to include everything in any other way. *Lambeth 1958 and You* could serve well as raw material for discussion groups.

No word of criticism of the Lambeth Conference is to be found in either of these two presentations: indeed they might be said to err on the side of over-enthusiasm. It is therefore all the more of a contrast to take up Dr Mascall's pamphlet. Unhappily his comments are tarnished

by the tone in which they are phrased. Dr Mascall rightly enjoys a wide reputation as a scholar: it is therefore particularly disappointing to find his pamphlet written in a spirit which may not only harm his own reputation but hinder the cause which he wishes to promote.

Although some people have been offended by the tone of the pamphlet, it is much to be hoped that this will not prevent them from giving proper weight to the points of substance which Dr Mascall raises.

Dr Mascall confines his criticisms to the sections of the Report dealing with South India, Ceylon, North India, and the Presbyterians. His comments raise matters which ought to have the benefit of open and full discussion. It would be no service either to the Lambeth Conference or to the Anglican Communion if the decisions of the Conference were to be invested with any kind of aura which would prevent them from being questioned. There are other parts of the Report dealing with Church unity which also need discussion, and a careful examination of the presuppositions and statements of the Unity Committee as a whole is much to be desired, before further commitments are made by the individual Churches of the Anglican Communion.

H. M. WADDAMS

## THE CATHOLIC-PROTESTANT DEBATE

THE RECOVERY OF UNITY. By E. L. MASCALL. Longmans. 25s.

ANGLICANISM AND EPISCOPACY. By A. L. PECK. Faith Press. 16s.

THESE two books have a negative side in common, namely a criticism of the Dean of Winchester's *Old Priest and New Presbyterian*. Two thirds of Dr Peck's book is, in fact, devoted to an examination of the presuppositions of Dr Sykes's thesis and of some of the evidence adduced to support it. The Dean's book is most obviously vulnerable in the last chapter where the author exceeds the historical limits of post-Reformation church history and commits himself to statements about episcopacy in the primitive Church, relying perhaps too much on a controversial article by Dr Telfer. Dr Peck and Dr Mascall show, however, that, as it has been expressed, Dr Sykes can also be criticized for having substituted an appeal to Anglican history for the Anglican appeal to history. Dr Peck goes further and suggests that even in his examination of Anglican history the Dean has not made sufficient allowance for accidental factors which influenced the attitude of many Anglicans of the seventeenth century to the ministries of Continental reformed churches. It is clear that Anglican divines of standing at that time distinguished sharply in regard to validity between the ministries of Protestant churches on the Continent and those of nonconformist bodies in England. What is not clear, however, is the theological basis of this distinction. The present reviewer must acknowledge that the criticisms of Dr Sykes's book made by the two authors under review, seem to him justified and well-based.



Dr Peck supplements his criticism of the Dean by an essay on the subject of Validity. Here he raises some important questions about the nature of the ministry and sacraments of non-episcopal bodies. There will, no doubt, be general agreement with his thesis that when people honestly and sincerely ask for grace God must be assumed to bestow it; and there will be sympathy with his difficulties about the use of terms "valid" and "invalid". Dr Peck would like us to abandon these words in regard to the ministry and sacraments. At the same time he wishes to retain the requirement of ordination in the apostolic succession on the ground that this is part of the divine ordering of the Church. Undoubtedly the terms objected to are often misunderstood as implying some sort of denial of the spiritual efficacy of the rites of non-episcopal churches, but it is to be feared that if they are to be abandoned some alternative terms will have to be found because there is a reality which has to be expressed. If the Catholic ministry and sacraments are divinely ordained then we are still left with the problem of what we are to say about the ministry and sacraments of bodies which have rejected or abandoned the apostolic succession. This whole field of theology urgently needs deep reconsideration, and Dr Peck's essay is welcome as raising the problem in an acute form, but he does not seem to the present reviewer to have found the right answer.

Dr Mascall, however, does seem to point the way in which the right answer may perhaps eventually be obtained, though neither he nor his readers will suppose the path to be short. The substance of his argument was, as he recognizes, set out prematurely some twelve years ago in the short report *Catholicity: a Study in the Conflict of Christian Traditions in the West*. As some readers will know, the plan in 1945-6 was that three groups—Anglo-Catholics, Evangelicals, and Free Churchmen—should independently examine the underlying causes of the contrast or conflict between the Catholic and Protestant traditions. Unhappily, as is now plain, the second and third groups did not get to work until the first had published its report, and their deliberations were clearly shaped by the contents of the *Catholicity* Report. In consequence the original plan misfired and the Evangelical and Free Church Reports largely took the form of criticisms of what were considered misrepresentations of Protestant positions contained in *Catholicity*. Thus the main plea of the *Catholicity* group was very largely obscured. That plea was that we should recognize the danger of attempting a synthesis of Catholic and Protestant elements as they have appeared since the Reformation, for "every attempt at synthesis must watch lest it take as its basis some misleading presuppositions which belong to some passing phase of Christian thought, and in consequence make confusion worse confounded". This was accompanied by the suggestion that "the true way of synthesis is . . . to go behind our contemporary systems and strive for the recovery of the fulness of Tradition within the thought and worship and order and life of each of the sundered portions of Christendom". Dr Mascall's book is an attempt to point certain ways in which this might be done.

In the first two chapters the author tries to show that certain differences observable among Christians to-day arise from certain medieval assumptions held in common but leading to divergent conclusions. In other writings Dr Mascall has argued this convincingly as regards the doctrine of the Eucharist. Here his argument will perhaps carry less conviction because great themes are too summarily discussed, and because a great deal is made of the distorting influence of Nominalism without any very clear account being given of what late medieval Nominalism was or why its influence should have been so devastating. Being himself a philosopher, Dr Mascall makes rather too many philosophical assumptions which may not be shared or even understood by many of his non-philosopher readers.

The third and fourth chapters develop some of the themes started in the first two. The author makes a penetrating examination of the thesis of Dr Nygren in *Agape and Eros*, and observes, "The question whether Protestant theology is adequate to Protestant religion is, I would suggest, one of the most urgent theological problems of our time". This is coming near to the heart of one of the great problems of reunion. Anglicans who have been engaged in discussions with Non-Conformists often have the frustrating sense that if only the seemingly intractable problem of the ordination of the existing Free Church ministers could be overcome no real theological obstacles to reunion would lie beyond. This may perhaps be over-simplification, but it does often appear that in the Anglo-Saxon world Protestant theology, as it was formulated in the great Reformation Confessions, is dead or dying. Anglicans are often unhappy about passages in the Articles, but it seems to the present writer that the Church of England adheres a good deal more closely to the Articles than do, for example, Calvinists to the Westminster Confession. It is religion rather than theology that is the strength of Protestantism. This is observable, for example, in the Interim Report of the Anglican-Methodist conversations.

In his fifth and sixth chapters Dr Mascall deals with the subject of Liturgy, which he has discussed elsewhere. Here he is able to point to concrete proof of the truth of his argument that we should try to go behind the Reformation positions. The modern Liturgical Movement, which has spread far beyond the bounds of the Roman Catholic Church, is having a profound influence in drawing Catholics and Protestants together. By the time this review is published some fruits of that movement as far as the Church of England is concerned will have been seen in the publication of the new services of Baptism and Confirmation as drawn up by the Liturgical Commission. It will be a tragedy if this wonderful fruit of Catholic-Evangelical co-operation is thrown away by conservatism, prejudice, or misunderstanding.

The seventh and eighth chapters are concerned with the question of the Ministry, about which something has been said earlier in this review. The ninth and tenth deal with Church and Papacy. Anyone who thinks that Catholicism of Dr Mascall's type leads to Rome should read these chapters with care. He will find in them a criticism of modern Roman

ecclesiology which is all the more devastating by being well-informed and charitable. If the projected Ecumenical Council is really to promote the union of Christendom the new Pope could do worse than make Dr Mascall's book compulsory reading for all its members. No doubt they would disagree with parts of it, but they would be made to think newly and refreshingly about serious fundamental problems.

ERIC KEMP

### DANGER AND OPPORTUNITY

LIVINGSTONE'S AFRICA—YESTERDAY AND TO-DAY. By JAMES GRIFFITHS, M.P. Epworth. 7s. 6d.

IN 1857 David Livingstone proclaimed to the people of Britain: "I go back to Africa to try to make an open path for commerce and Christianity; do you carry out the work which I have begun." The double challenge was accepted. In *Livingstone's Africa—Yesterday and To-day* (the expanded version of his Beckley Social Service Lecture for 1958) the Rt Hon. James Griffiths sketches subsequent history and presents the contemporary challenge of those parts of Central Africa which are closely connected with the United Kingdom, namely the Rhodesias and Nyasaland, Tanganyika, Uganda, and Kenya. Within these territories is occurring "not just the transformation of the old social order but its disintegration and virtual destruction". The prospects are at the same time frightening, because of racial distrust, and brilliant, because of the wealth potentially within the grasp of all racial groups. The author subtly analyses the motives of Europeans and Africans alike and examines with care and lucidity the obstacles in the way of orderly progress. He deals fairly with the weaknesses and strength of all races in the area and enunciates balanced judgements regarding the political steps which appear to him to be urgently necessary. Unfortunately he seems to suggest that sweet reasonableness and forthright utterance constitute the main panacea for the ills of Central Africa. This attitude is somewhat naïve when one is confronted by emotional strains and stresses which lie deeper than reason. This book is informative and well documented. It ought certainly to be read by those who are concerned to ascertain the facts before the momentous conference in 1960 when the constitution of the Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland will be reviewed.

A. E. A. SULSTON

### PASTORALIA

THE PASTORAL RESPONSIBILITY OF THE CHURCH TO-DAY. By THOMAS WOOD. S.P.C.K. 1s. 6d.

PREACHING THE CROSS. By J. C. FENTON. S.P.C.K. 7s. 6d.

BELIEVING. By H. M. WADDAMS. Faith Press. 8s. 6d.

ANY parish priest who feels in need of encouragement (and who does not?) should spend 1s. 6d. on this pamphlet. And if he is frightened by

the sub-title "an inaugural lecture delivered at St David's University College Lampeter", the first paragraph will reassure him that if Thomas Wood delivered this as D. J. James Professor of Pastoral Theology, the experience on which it is grounded is, I suspect, of Thomas Wood, parish priest.

Outlining four possible attitudes that a Christian may take to the world to-day Professor Wood explains why (a) "escapist", (b) "indifference", (c) "agitation and ambivalence" will not do; and why (d) "catholic" or "comprehensive" must. Then he tells what this attitude will involve.

Fully conscious of the shortage of clergy, he asks for a candid examination of our normal method of training; and suggests how theological colleges which have the good fortune to be situated near a university might well enter upon a new and creative phase in their history.

The final section will leave the parish priest humble yet inspired, and angry young clergymen will admit that here is a lecturer whose experience might tempt him to dream dreams, but who undoubtedly sees visions. So will they.

"Taking the Three Hours" is a task that falls as a terrifying duty to many clergy year by year. So they will turn to J. C. Fenton's book for help.

In Introduction I the author tries to convince us of the weakness of using the traditional Seven Words as though they all came from one narrative. The reader who is so convinced will go on to see how Mr Fenton considers the text of the Passion and Resurrection according to St Mark. He suggests that one gospel is taken, the story of the Passion divided into six sections and half an hour given to each. Though I confess that for various reasons I did not feel wholly converted to the author's suggestion, yet his study of the Marcan account was stimulating. Parish priests will have to do some sound digestion if they are to reinterpret their thoughts to the average congregation after reading this book.

"Much of the opposition which is current against dogmatic Christianity is caused partly by the fact that its opponents do not properly appreciate the inner content of the dogmas which they are criticising. In so far as they fail to see the point of the dogmas they may often rightly complain that it is because those who have been commissioned to teach have never succeeded in explaining them."

Most priests would have to plead guilty in some measure to this charge of failure. So *Believing*—a new look at the Nicene Creed—is exactly what they want for the sincere inquirer who is genuinely puzzled by the divinity of Christ; cannot understand what we mean by "omnipotence"; wonders what is meant by "miracle"; in short, who wants a plain intelligible explanation of the Nicene Creed. Canon Waddams gives one concisely and humbly.



The sixth former who will not be pushed off with glib answers, and the man who wants so hard to be able to say the Creed in sincerity but will wrestle till dawn rather than accept moonshine as truth, will be helped by this book. Further, the complete honesty of the writer will have its attraction to all such.

My only regret is that the book could not have had bolder type for the headings at the top of the pages and a dust cover as stimulating as its contents.

GEORGE REINDORP

THE WORK OF A PASTOR. By E. K. ELLIS. Mowbrays. 9s. 6d.

THIRTY-SIX years of work in a parish entitle any speaker or writer to a good hearing. In the case of this writer we are at once ready to award respect and gratitude for his obvious love of people and of his work, and for the high standard of devotion and duty which he upholds. Moreover, it is most refreshing to get a book on parish life which is neither speculative nor experimental, but which has the conviction, and the power of conveying conviction, that old methods tried and found successful should be retained.

In his introduction the author tells us that he is not to deal with many aspects of pastoral work. He should tell us what they are, for otherwise we find the end of the book abrupt and ourselves still anxious to know his opinion of many things, and to hear how he deals with the sad, the mad, and the bad in the great variety of forms in which they present themselves to a priest. We must hope there will be another volume.

Similarly, the opening chapters on Prayer and Study, which are the springboard of the whole book, need further expansion to be of great help to any young priest, or to recall and reconstitute those who have given up in face of the odds. The old and faithful will be glad enough to agree with him in all that he says, having devised their own ways and means.

A larger bibliography would give his own findings reinforcement, and lift them out of the necessarily limited approach of one pastor, however good.

GEORGE M. BOSWORTH

CURATE OF SOULS. Edited by J. R. H. MOORMAN. S.P.C.K. 9s. 6d.

THE HEART OF A PRIEST. Edited by J. H. L. MORRELL. S.P.C.K. 9s. 6d.

THE first of these two attractive volumes is edited by Dr Moorman, and presents us with ten selections from the writers in the century 1660-1760 on the priestly life and work. We find here a great diversity of approach, from the gravity of Jeremy Taylor and the worldly wit of Gilbert Burnet (his remarks upon preferment will delight many hearts), to the flame of John Newton and the astonishing virtuosity of John



Wesley, who demands an intellectual standard for the clergy which C.A.C.T.M. to-day would reluctantly have to refuse.

All these writers give us eloquent and timely reminder of the great essentials of the clerical life. Perhaps it is true to say they are better at saying what a priest should do and be than telling him how to carry out what they recommend.

With one reservation this does not apply to the second work—a volume of selections from the writings of Canon W. C. E. Newbolt (Canon and Chancellor of St Paul's at the beginning of this century), edited by the Archdeacon of Lewes. Newbolt does not make demands without explaining how they are to be met; and seems not only more conscious, but more in the midst of, the special difficulties of a priest's life. Perhaps this is not quite true of his writings here on study, but it is true of everything else in this book, which is well entitled *The Heart of a Priest*.

We must hope that those who read this book for the first time will go to their theological libraries and get out the four volumes—*Speculum Sacerdotum*, *Priestly Ideals*, *Priestly Blemishes*, and *The Apostles of the Lord*—from which this admirable selection has been made.

The editor himself has written in his introduction a penetrating and devout assessment of the priestly life, and has added an appendix on prayer which will be of great use to those who are inclined to feel themselves too much beset by parochial affairs.

GEORGE M. BOSWORTH

## THE DIVORCE QUESTION

DIVORCE AND RE-MARRIAGE IN ANGLICANISM. By A. R. WINNETT. Macmillan. 30s.

THIS book is the result of much serious and patient research, and the author is to be most heartily congratulated on it. His purpose has been to investigate the opinions of theologians on the question of re-marriage after divorce, and it would be hard to name an author who has not been consulted, and whose views have not been given a proper consideration. It is not a tendentious work, and the author is only concerned that both views of re-marriage after divorce should be fully explored. There is a brief introduction dealing with the pre-Reformation law of marriage and nullity which was the common law of the Western Church. He deals with the opinions of the continental reformers who advocated divorce for adultery. Calvin, though believing in re-marriage after divorcing an adulterous wife, claimed that divorce was only necessary because of the "wicked forbearance of magistrates" in not enforcing the death penalty for adultery. This view and the Matthean exception were responsible for the Continental reformers breaking away from the Western Canon Law.

Dr Winnett deals carefully with the Marriage Canon of the proposed *Reformatio Legum* which, had it become law, would have placed the

Church of England in the same position as the Continental reformers, but was fortunately never enacted. Certainly the dissolubilist position found much sympathy amongst Anglican divines of that period, but the Canons of 1603-4 asserted the indissoluble position which has ever since been the law of the Church of England.

The position of Laud and Cosin in the Rich and Roos cases respectively are examined with great care. Laud seems to have acted for ambition's sake, but soon repented, keeping the anniversary day of the marriage (St Stephen's) as a day of fasting and penitence for the rest of his life. It is an interesting case, for the divorce was only a *mensa et thoro*, and only the Bigamy Act of James I exempted the divorced partner of the re-marriage from the death penalty. Cosin's action is much more difficult to explain, though much written evidence of the way his mind was working is in existence. It would seem that either his anti-Papalism got the better of his judgement, or that his mind was failing.

The author makes it very clear that, however some theologians have inclined and still incline to the dissoluble view of marriage, the Church of England has never in her official formularies held any other view than that marriage is indissoluble, even though much sympathy has been shown by individual bishops to the dissolubilist view, but even since 1857 some bishops have refused to issue licences for divorced persons to re-marry in church. One of the fears which haunted the indissolubilist theologians was of collusive divorce. This fear has been only too horribly shown to be true, and with the added grounds for divorce, the Divorce Courts are over-worked.

It is unfair to suggest that the present stricter position in regard to re-marriage in church is due to the Archbishop of Canterbury. The majority of Anglicans approve of his position; but it is due to the increasing number of divorces that he has been compelled to emphasize the official position of Anglicanism during his primacy.

One repeats again that this is a work of great scholarship which the reviewer has read three times, and can only find one misprint, and that in a footnote, referring to the Stawell case.

F. E. P. S. LANGTON

## CHRISTIAN HEALING

ANXIETY IN CHRISTIAN EXPERIENCE. By WAYNE E. OATES. Allen & Unwin. 15s.

AFTER studying and profiting from Dr Wayne Oates' previous book, *Religious Factors in Mental Illness*, many of us looked forward eagerly to his next volume. After reading *Anxiety in Christian Experience* we are conscious of no sense of disappointment but rather of gratitude for a book of considerable importance to the parish priest. He shares with his people anxiety concerning many things, and when reading St Paul's

injunction, "In nothing be anxious", he will often have cause to look at his own attitude to life and experience somewhat ruefully.

In this book the reader will discover not only what anxiety basically is, but also how to help and advise the anxious—something which we are compelled to do in our own pastoral work, yet often, how inadequately!

Each of the nine chapters is concerned with a different "shade" of anxiety, yet these do not exist in isolation, but blend as do the colours of the spectrum. In the spiritual pilgrimage of men and women, anxiety plays a larger part than sometimes we realize. For instance, economic anxiety is real enough but, as we know full well, it is so often tied up with spiritual hindrances. And how often have we been confronted with the anxieties attached to bereavement and knew not what to say? Or of legalistic anxieties concerning sin found in the "scrupulous" and felt either impatience or bewilderment? We look deeper, at our own souls, and find there much for anxiety.

Dr Oates has much to say of these things, and not only from the point of view of pastoral psychology, in which he is obviously gifted. Right through there is the wise appeal to Holy Scripture, without which, as the author points out, many pastoral techniques merely become "neat tricks tinkering with people's souls". To biblical truth is added psychological truth; and to these, a wide clinical experience. The transcriptions of conversations, the multitude of case-histories, and the methods which are implied, have much to teach us about our day-to-day tasks. Concerned as we are with people and their problems, we often feel at a loss in trying to give adequate assistance. Worldly wisdom alone is useless: spiritual platitudes are merely sickening. The time taken in studying this valuable book and putting its lessons into practice will be well spent.

The only thing to regret is that we have had to wait some three and a half years before publication in this country.

NORMAN SMALL